

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
H.R. 8144

TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BOARD FOR
INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING, TO AUTHORIZE THE CON-
TINUATION OF ASSISTANCE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND
RADIO LIBERTY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JULY 31 AND AUGUST 1, 1973



Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1973

21-061

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin | WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, California |
| WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio | PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey |
| L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina | WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan |
| DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida | H. R. GROSS, Iowa |
| CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Michigan | EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois |
| ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania | VERNON W. THOMSON, Wisconsin |
| DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota | PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois |
| BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York | JOHN H. BUCHANAN, Jr., Alabama |
| JOHN C. CULVER, Iowa | J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida |
| LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana | GUY VANDER JAGT, Michigan |
| ABRAHAM KAZEN, Jr., Texas | ROBERT H. STEEBLE, Connecticut |
| LESTER L. WOLFF, New York | PIERRE S. DU PONT, Delaware |
| JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York | CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr., Ohio |
| GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania | ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS, California |
| ROY A. TAYLOR, North Carolina | EDWARD G. BIESTER, Jr., Pennsylvania |
| JOHN W. DAVIS, Georgia | LARRY WINN, Jr., Kansas |
| OGDEN R. REID, New York | BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York |
| MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Massachusetts | TENNYSON GUYER, Ohio |
| LEO J. RYAN, California | |
| CHARLES WILSON, Texas | |
| DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr., Michigan | |

MARIAN A. CZARNECKI, *Chief of Staff*

JOHN CHAPMAN CHESTER, *Staff Consultant*

PAULA PEAK, *Staff Assistant*

(II)

CONTENTS

LIST OF WITNESSES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Tuesday, July 31, 1973..... | 1 |
| Barrett, Hon. Edward, director, Communications Institute, Academy for Educational Development..... | 22 |
| Durkee, William P., president, Radio Free Europe..... | 35 |
| Eisenhower, Hon. Milton S., Chairman, President's Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting..... | 9 |
| Gronouski, Hon. John A., dean, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs..... | 18 |
| Gullion, Hon. Edmund A., dean, Fletcher School of Law and Diplo- macy, Tufts University..... | 29 |
| Roche, Hon. John P., professor of politics, Brandeis University..... | 26 |
| Sargeant, Howland, president, Radio Liberty..... | 35 |
| Stocssel, Hon. Walter J., Jr., Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, Department of State..... | 4 |
| Wednesday, August 1, 1973..... | 65 |
| Durkee, William P., president, Radio Free Europe..... | 90 |
| Mazewski, president, Polish American Congress..... | 78 |
| Sargeant, Howland, president, Radio Liberty..... | 88 |
| Spilners, Ilgyars J., president, American Latvian Association, and representative, Joint Baltic American Committee..... | 67 |

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

| | |
|---|----|
| Statement submitted by Hon. Milton S. Eisenhower on Soviet and Eastern European jamming..... | 12 |
| Article by Robert G. Kaiser, the "Impact of U.S. Radio Abroad," the Washington Post, July 28, 1973..... | 23 |
| Statement prepared by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty providing information or viewpoints conflicting with statements in the "Impact of U.S. Radio Abroad" by Robert G. Kaiser..... | 30 |
| Summary, International Radio Broadcasting Activities, fiscal year 1973 budget request..... | 40 |
| Statement submitted by Hon. Milton S. Eisenhower on Jewish and Baltic language programming..... | 45 |
| Letter from George Meany, president, AFL-CIO, July 11, 1973..... | 59 |
| Letter and CWA resolution from Joseph A. Beirne, president, Communica- tions Workers of America, July 19, 1973..... | 60 |
| Statement submitted by Maury Lisann, independent researcher, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University..... | 61 |
| Letter and statement submitted by Zbigniew Brzezinski, director, Research Institute on Communist Affairs, Columbia University, July 27, 1973..... | 65 |
| Statement submitted by the Joint Baltic American Committee, August 1, 1973, on the Baltic Question and the Conference on Security and Coop- eration in Europe, Arrests of the Baltic Leaders in Helsinki..... | 69 |
| Statement submitted by Hon. Stewart B. McKinney, a Representative in Congress from Connecticut..... | 86 |

APPENDIX

| | |
|--|-----|
| Correspondence of Hon. Thomas E. Morgan, chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs; Hon. James A. Burke, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts; Osvalds Akmentins, Latvian Press Society in America; and the Department of State..... | 103 |
| Correspondence of Hon. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, chairman, Subcommittee on Europe, Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Prof. Alfred G. Meyer, professor of political science, University of Michigan..... | 105 |

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

TUESDAY, JULY 31, 1973

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10:25 a.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Thomas E. Morgan (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman MORGAN. The committee will please come to order.

We meet this morning to begin hearings on H.R. 8144, a bill to authorize appropriations for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

[The bill follows:]

[H.R. 8144, 93d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting, to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares:

(1) That it is the policy of the United States to promote the right of freedom of opinion and expression, including the freedom "to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers," in accordance with article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(2) That open communication of information and ideas among the peoples of the world contributes to international peace and stability, and that the promotion of such communication is in the interests of the United States;

(3) That Free Europe, Incorporated, and the Radio Liberty Committee, Incorporated, (hereinafter referred to as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty), have demonstrated their effectiveness in furthering the open communication of information and ideas in Eastern Europe and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

(4) That the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as independent broadcast media, operating in a manner not inconsistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States and in accordance with high professional standards, is in the national interest; and

(5) That in order to provide an effective instrumentality for the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to encourage a constructive dialog with the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Eastern Europe, it is desirable to establish a Board for International Broadcasting.

ESTABLISHMENT AND ORGANIZATION

SEC. 3. (a) There is established a Board for International Broadcasting (herein referred to as the "Board").

(b) (1) COMPOSITION OF BOARD.—The Board shall consist of seven members, two of whom shall be ex officio members. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, five voting members, one of whom

(1)

he shall designate as chairman. Not more than three of the members of the Board appointed by the President shall be of the same political party. The chief operating executive of Radio Free Europe and the chief operating executive of Radio Liberty shall be ex officio members of the Board and shall participate in the activities of the Board, but shall not vote in the determinations of the Board.

(2) SELECTION.—Members of the Board appointed by the President shall be citizens of the United States who are not concurrently regular full-time employees of the United States Government. Such members shall be selected by the President from among Americans distinguished in the fields of foreign policy or mass communications.

(3) TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENTIALLY APPOINTED MEMBERS.—In appointing the initial voting members of the Board, the President shall designate three of the members appointed by him to serve for a term of three years and two members to serve for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of office of each member of the Board so appointed shall be three years. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, members to fill vacancies occurring prior to the expiration of a term, in which case the members so appointed shall serve for the remainder of such term. Any member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

(4) TERM OF OFFICE OF EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—Ex officio members of the Board shall serve on the Board during their terms of service as chief operating executives of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty.

(5) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Board appointed by the President shall while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties relating to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this section, including traveltime, be entitled to receive compensation equal to the daily equivalent of the compensation prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. While away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Ex officio members of the Board shall not be entitled to any compensation under this Act, but may be allowed travel expenses as provided in the preceding sentence.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized:

(1) To make grants to Radio Free Europe and to Radio Liberty in order to carry out the purposes set forth in section 2 of this Act;

(2) To review and evaluate the mission and operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and to assess the quality, effectiveness, and professional integrity of their broadcasting within the context of the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States;

(3) To encourage the most efficient utilization of available resources by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to undertake, or request that Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty undertake, such studies as may be necessary to identify areas in which the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty may be made more efficient and economical;

(4) To develop and apply such financial procedures, and to make such audits of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as the Board may determine are necessary, to assure that grants are applied in accordance with the purposes for which such grants are made;

(5) To develop and apply such evaluative procedures as the Board may determine are necessary to assure that grants are applied in a manner not inconsistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States Government;

(6) To appoint such staff personnel as may be necessary, subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates;

(7) A. To procure temporary and intermittent personal services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate provided for GS-18; and

B. To allow those providing such services, while away from their homes or their regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently while so employed;

(8) To report annually to the President and the Congress on or before the 30th day of October, summarizing the activities of the Board during the year ending the preceding June 30, and reviewing and evaluating the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty during such year; and

(9) To prescribe such regulations as the Board deems necessary to govern the manner in which its functions shall be carried out.

(b) In carrying out the foregoing functions, the Board shall bear in mind the necessity of maintaining the professional independence and integrity of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall require that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty keep records which fully disclose the amount and disposition of assistance provided under this Act, the total cost of the undertakings or programs in connection with which such assistance is given or used, that portion of the cost of the undertakings or programs supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Board and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty which in the opinion of the Board or the Comptroller General may be related or pertinent to the assistance provided under this Act.

ROLE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 6. To assist the Board in carrying out its functions, the Secretary of State shall provide the Board with such information regarding the foreign policy of the United States as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

PUBLIC SUPPORT

SEC. 7. The Board is authorized to receive donations, bequests, devises, gifts, and other forms of contributions of cash, services, and other property, from persons, corporations, foundations, and all other groups and entities, both within the United States and abroad, and, pursuant to the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property for the carrying out of its functions. For the purposes of section 170, 2055, and 2522 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (26 U.S.C. 170, 2055, or 2522), the Board shall be deemed to be a corporation described in section 170(c)(2), 2055(a)(2), or 2522(a)(2) of the Code, as the case may be.

FINANCING

SEC. 8. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended \$50,300,000 for fiscal year 1974 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1975 to carry out the purposes of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law and for other nondiscretionary costs.

IMPLEMENTATION

(b) To allow for the orderly implementation of this Act, the Secretary of State is authorized to make grants to Radio Free Europe and to Radio Liberty under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate for their continued operation until a majority of the voting members of the Board have been appointed and qualified, and until funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act are available to the Board.

Chairman MORGAN. Two years ago, this committee passed a bill calling for the appointment of a commission to study future operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to make recommendations to the Congress. Although this proposal did not survive the conference with the Senate, the President subsequently appointed such a commission, headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president

emeritus of Johns Hopkins University and a distinguished American. This Study Commission commenced its work in the summer of 1972 and submitted a report of its findings to the President earlier this year.

On May 24, 1973, at the request of the executive branch, I introduced the bill H.R. 8144, which is based on the Commission's recommendations.

To testify on behalf of this proposed legislation, we have with us this morning: the Honorable Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, and Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman, Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting.

Other members of the Commission also are present. After the statements of Dr. Eisenhower and Secretary Stoessel we will have these gentlemen at the committee table and they can take part in the question and answer period.

We welcome you gentlemen to the committee. I understand there are two prepared statements. Mr. Secretary, we are going to hear you first. Then we will hear Dr. Eisenhower after you complete your statement. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. WALTER J. STOESEL, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR EUROPEAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. STOESEL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to stress very briefly a few essential points in connection with the bill before you establish a board for international broadcasting to administer grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Through their broadcast activities, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have, for nearly a generation, sought to assure to these peoples a continuing source of information on topics of fundamental importance to them. By providing such information, the two stations have gained a wide and devoted audience and have contributed to the process of reducing tensions in Europe. Their continued efforts will help to keep that process from being a short-term phenomenon.

As the President pointed out in his statement of May 7 on the release of the report of the Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are "highly professional media for news and news analysis, functioning as a kind of substitute free press for a crucial part of the world."

The Board of International Broadcasting, which H.R. 8144 would authorize, is the best mechanism we can devise for preserving the professional independence of the two stations while assuring that their broadcast operations are not inconsistent with the broad objectives of U.S. foreign policy. I believe that the careful study done by the Presidential Commission, ably chaired by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, demonstrates clearly the feasibility of this approach.

We believe that the Board for International Broadcasting will be an effective mechanism for providing support for responsible broadcasting operations by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. If the stations are to continue their activities in behalf of their millions of listeners, however, they must be adequately funded. Federal financial

support of the radios, as proposed by the Presidential Commission after thorough study of the problem, should continue.

For the past several years, the stations have struggled to maintain their operations in the face of reductions in available funds and personnel and uncertainty as to their future. We believe the \$50.3 million budget proposed in this bill for fiscal year 1974 is essential to maintain the effectiveness of their operations. Moreover, we have been exploring the question of funding a portion of the stations' future operations with certain Western European governments.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Dr. Milton Eisenhower and his fellow Commissioners have done an excellent job in producing their recommendations. With your permission, Dr. Eisenhower is prepared to make a statement regarding the work of the Commission, and he and his colleagues are fully prepared to explain their findings.

Mr. Howland Sargeant, president of the Radio Liberty Committee, Inc., and Mr. William Durkee, president of Free Europe, Inc., are also with me today, should you have questions about the operation of the stations.

In closing, I would like to call to the committee's attention the Department of State's more detailed statement of views, which was presented to the committee yesterday and is available for inclusion in the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Without objection, Mr. Secretary, we will make that longer statement part of the record.

[The statement follows:]

VIEWS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE ON H.R. 8144

The purpose of H.R. 8144 is to authorize continued Government grants in fiscal years 1974-1975 in support of the Broadcasts of Radio Free Europe (RFE) and Radio Liberty (RL) and to establish a sound mechanism for administering those grants. It is, in the view of the Department of State, the best way to make sure that these essential nonofficial radios maintain their professional independence while continuing to broadcast in a manner not inconsistent with broad U.S. foreign policy objectives.

The substance of H.R. 8144 was developed by the Commission on International Radio Broadcasting appointed by the President in August, 1972, to study this matter and report their findings to him. Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Chairman of the Commission, and his distinguished colleagues Edward W. Barrett, John A. Gronouski, Edmund A. Gullion, and John P. Roche, submitted their report "The Right to Know" earlier this year and the President released it May 7 with a strong endorsement.

The principal findings of the report are embodied in the Bill before this Committee in paragraphs (4) and (5) of Section 1. These state "That the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as independent broadcast media, operating in a manner not inconsistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States and in accordance with high professional standards, is in the national interests;" and "That in order to provide an effective instrumentality for the continuation of assistance of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to encourage a constructive dialogue with the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Eastern Europe, it is desirable to establish a Board of International Broadcasting."

The reasons for the Commission's finding that the continuation of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe Broadcasting is in the national interest are cogently argued in its report. Addressing itself to the viewpoint that recent improvements in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States dictated termination of the two Radios, the Commission stated:

"The Commission is satisfied that the two radio operations have adjusted progressively to meet the requirements of changing times, that they do not

operate to keep alive Cold War animosities, and that they contribute to détente by adding to knowledge and understanding."

The report pointed out that Soviet and Eastern European leaders and media have made it clear, even after the thaw in East-West relations began, that the principles of coexistence do not "offer possibilities of relaxing the ideological struggle." The President, in his June 1972 report to Congress on his visit to the Soviet Union, called attention to the fact that "Soviet ideology still proclaims hostility to some of America's most basic values," and that Soviet leaders "will continue to be totally dedicated competitors of the United States."

The recent improvement in East-West relations has taken place while the stations have been operating, the report pointed out, and the Soviet Union apparently does not think its own major effort of "ideological struggle against imperialism" is damaging to such relations.

The Commission pointed to the efforts of the two radios to keep their audiences fully informed on events both in the world outside and within their own countries, and it considered that East European leaders have been obliged increasingly to take popular "pressures" into consideration. The Commission said it was confident that the radios, by providing information and interpretation, "will continue to be of help in future negotiations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in such areas as strategic arms limitation, trade, European security and environmental protection."

The Commission concluded that it is in the interests of the United States that the stations continue until the Soviet Union and East European countries permit a free flow of truthful information.

The Radio in a Period of Improving East-West relations

The welcome readiness of the Soviet leadership to enter into agreements relating to arms control and to seek a reduction of tension in Europe is related very directly to the increasing need recognized by them and by leaders in Eastern Europe to meet the rising demands of their peoples for a fuller, more satisfying daily existence, more nearly comparable to that enjoyed by Europeans in the West. This is a highly positive development. It is in the U.S. national interest to encourage this trend and to maintain and broaden the dialogue with the leaders of Eastern Europe as well.

We have, in view of their important role in this process, equally good reasons for maintaining a dialogue with the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe by means of radio broadcasting. Until there is a considerably freer movement of persons from East to West, a considerably greater range of human contacts, and a considerably broader internal dissemination of information and opinion to the peoples of these countries, international radio broadcasting will remain the principal source of information and analyses about the current negotiations in Europe. While they can receive international news and analyses from official Western Radios (like the Voice of America), the real meaning of détente to them is its effect and this gets into areas difficult to handle in official broadcasting. These people want to know the relationship between détente and the improvement of their own conditions of life. They want to know how their own government's priorities are affected. They want to know how the opportunities provided by an era of negotiation are being used by their leaders. They want to know if they are to receive only some material benefits from détente and be deprived of most of the non-material benefits such as freer movement, more varied and complete information. These are some of the significant issues relevant to the aspirations of these peoples for a meaningful and lasting détente, not one which can be turned on and off for temporary political advantage.

These are the issues to which Radio Free Europe's experienced newsmen and analysts have been giving their greatest attention, the issues on which Radio Liberty has broadcast, during the past year, a significant body of analytical material emanating for independent thinkers in the Soviet Union whose product otherwise receives very little circulation. This is the type of information which is not and should not be analyzed in detail by the Voice of America, the official international broadcaster of the U.S. Government.

It is the Department's view that these important channels of communication to the peoples of the area have contributed to the current process of negotiations looking toward reduced tension in Europe and that their continuation will help keep that process from being a short-term phenomenon. The degree to which our Allies and other non-Communist states in Europe share our view of the importance of a freer exchange of ideas and information, and closer human contacts, to a meaningful process of détente has been amply demonstrated in the prepara-

tory talks in Helsinki for the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and at the meeting European Foreign Ministers there early in July. At western insistence, provision has been made at Helsinki for these matters to be highlighted in a major agenda item at the Conference, and in a way which should provide an opportunity to negotiate specific practical improvements.

The Board for International Broadcasting

The Commission on International Radio Broadcasting correctly identified the objectives governing the U.S. Government's relationship with the radios. They are as follows:

The professional independence and hence the credibility and effectiveness of the stations must be preserved.

Organizational arrangements and procedures must be such as to insure that publicly funded facilities are not used in a manner inconsistent with United States foreign policy objectives.

The organizational structure should permit the use of funds from American and non-American sources, both public and private, and must provide for appropriate accountability. All funds should be openly provided and publicly reported.

The organizational structure should be shaped to stimulate maximum efficiency and economy in the operations of the stations.

Since the condition of free movement of information into and within the Soviet sphere, which could make the stations unnecessary, is not likely to be achieved soon, the organizational structure should be sufficiently strong and flexible to serve for at least a decade, if necessary.

The report makes clear why a small Board for International Broadcasting is the best way to meet these objectives.

European Financial Support

There was substantial sentiment expressed in some quarters a year ago in favor of European financial support for RFE and RL. The Department concluded at that time, however, that formal approaches to European governments by the United States should await thorough consideration of the matter by the Presidential Study Commission. With the President's endorsement of the Commission's recommendations, the Department has moved to encourage strongly the participation of European Governments in the financing of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe research. Furthermore, the annual corporate fundraising drive of the Radio Free Europe Fund is under way and we expect this will be supplemented this year by efforts of Radio Liberty.

With respect to European support from private sources, a group of leading private citizens established last year the West European Advisory Committee on the Free Flow of Information and is now seeking private contributions in Europe.

It is not known at this point whether governments which decide to support the radios' research will wish to do so directly—in exchange for research produced—, through the European non-governmental fund-raising body, through a Board for International Broadcasting, or through other bilateral or multilateral instrumentalities of their own choosing. But the Board, as proposed in Section 7 of H.R. 8144 will have among its competences the right to receive contributions and to use them for the purposes of the Bill. A small Board of distinguished citizens with few administrative expenses and functions limited to those outlined in Section 4 of the Bill would be, in the eyes of any non-governmental or foreign contributors, as preferable as a recipient of contributions as compared to a large U.S. Government department which has a wide range of functions and responsibilities.

The Department of State hopes to lessen in every way possible, including the proposed Board's exercise of its function of searching for economies, the burden on the U.S. taxpayer. But we share the basic judgment in the report that we must realistically see these radios as an activity which will continue to be largely U.S. financed. In looking to the principle of burden sharing for a reduction of U.S. costs, we must obviously place our emphasis in our approaches to the Europeans on the much more significant area of defense costs.

Costs Affected by Devaluation

As in the case of European defense costs, devaluation has made RFE and RL more expensive. The \$50.3 million funding request for FY 74 contains \$31.6 million for RFE, \$18.3 million for RL and \$275,000 for the Board for International Broadcasting proposed in the legislation. The radio figures do not provide for any

increase in present goods, personnel or new equipment (other than replacement equipment) but will maintain the same level of programming as FY 73.

The increase over the radios' FY 73 costs—\$9.6 million—is needed for the following reasons:

(1) to meet increased costs estimated at \$3.5 million caused by the dollar devaluation. The radios spend over 80 percent of their budgets in foreign currencies.

(2) to reinstate or partially restore payments to pension plans of \$2.4 million which went unfunded in the prior two years due to insufficient funds.

(3) to cover normal wage and price increases which will total \$3.2 million given the rising salary scales both here and in Germany attributable to the impact of inflation.

(4) to maintain equipment and facilities at a cost of an added \$500,000.

The radios, a significant factor adding to the pressures which moved the USSR toward a policy of reduced tensions in Europe, can be maintained for less than the price of 4 F-14s.

There is no question that this is a price worth paying. While we should definitely seek a European participation in the manner outlined by the Presidential Commission, we should be clear in our own minds that we are supporting an activity definitely in our own interest. We are supporting an activity whose cost, in the burden-sharing context, is not comparable to the much more significant defense cost sharing we are seeking.

Communist States Endorse Continued Struggle of Ideas

International Radio Broadcasting is an activity which, not just in our view but also in the view of authoritative spokesmen for the Communist side, is not in conflict with an era of negotiation. Tamas Palos, Deputy Head of the Agitation and Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party, quite explicitly stated the Communist case in a Budapest Radio Symposium last November 21:

"If we want the support of the masses, if we want them to be convinced of our truth, then we must tell them this truth. Thus, mobilization—within the country but also on an international scale—requires an intensified ideological struggle . . . The intensification of the ideological struggle is a normal development under conditions of peaceful coexistence. Because, what is peaceful coexistence? Countless relations, and these countless relations have an ideological basis . . . Thus, the ideological struggle goes hand in hand with peaceful coexistence. Therefore, it is in our interest that this ideological struggle be expanded."

The unrestricted sale of Soviet newspapers and magazines in the West continues. The distribution of Soviet assessments in the Daily Worker in the United States goes on. The support rendered by the Soviet Union to Communist parties abroad in the name of "proletarian internationalism," has not stopped. Moscow Radio's substantial broadcasting continues to be supplemented by so-called "unofficial" Soviet station "Peace and Progress". The weekly 250 hours continues to be beamed to North America by Eastern European and Soviet radios in English and in languages familiar to ethnic groups here.

The myriad channels of communications in the U.S. and in the West open to the Soviets and their allies are full of evidence that they do not consider the flow of information from *East to West* to be in contradiction with their concept of peaceful coexistence or of détente. Therefore, we need not be self-conscious or anxious about the continuation of radio broadcasting by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. We need only consider whether it continues to be in the U.S. interest. Our own most experienced academicians, diplomats, and journalists reach the conclusion that it is not the time to reduce the free flow of information from West to East. A report by the Atlantic Council's Advisory Committee on CSCE and MBFR issued last November stated, in the section of Freedom of Communication that:

"A weighty argument for retaining the stations, in our opinion, would be that East-West relations have improved significantly over the past ten years while these stations were operating and caused a demonstrable measure of political liberalization in the Soviet Bloc countries in which their broadcasts have a wide audience. It should be kept in mind that the East European party rulers formulate their policies under popular pressures, even while they seek to maintain their control by means of coercion. To abolish these radio stations now in the interest of improving the political environment would be to deprive the peoples of Eastern Europe of the truth and of their communication with the West, but more importantly, it would return to the communist regimes the monopoly of communication in their countries. It is very likely that this would result in a regression

of communist domestic policies toward 'totalitarianism.' In this context, any improvement which the abandonment of these Western Broadcasting stations might bring to East-West relations would probably prove shallow in the long run. European security cannot be served by the re-isolation of Eastern Europe."

The Washington Post summed it up soundly and succinctly when it said: "Détente, if it means anything, means widening the West's contacts with the East, not helping the East seal off its people from the West. It means the exchange of people, goods, words and ideas. This is the essential business of RFE and RL."

Chairman MORGAN. Dr. Eisenhower, you may proceed, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON. MILTON S. EISENHOWER, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENT'S STUDY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RADIO BROADCASTING

Mr. EISENHOWER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee.

My previous activities which may have some bearing on the current assignment include the post of Associate Director of War Information during World War II, OWI being the predecessor of the United States Information Agency. I was also the first Chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, with membership on the Executive Committee of UNESCO in Paris—a major purpose of the organization being to promote the free flow of information among the peoples of the world, regardless of national boundaries, a commitment to which the Soviet Union is a party.

With me are my fellow Commissioners: Edward Barrett, Director of the Communications Institute, Academy for Educational Development, and previously Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs at a time the Voice of America was under his general supervision; John A. Gronouski, dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs and formerly Ambassador to Poland where he regularly received the broadcasts of Radio Free Europe; Edmund A. Gullion, dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, formerly a Foreign Service Career Minister, Ambassador to the Congo, and Deputy Director of the U.S. Disarmament Administration, and John P. Roche, professor of politics, Brandeis University, formerly Special Consultant to the President of the United States.

Gentlemen, my opening statement will be fairly brief, about 12 minutes.

In our discussions with Senators and Representatives at the outset of our study of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty we found that four questions were constantly raised:

Are the radios a positive encouragement or a deterrent to détente?

If the radios are continued, what Federal agency should receive appropriations and then make allocations to the two private corporations which operate the stations?

How can all concerned be assured that these private stations—operating essentially as a free press, which is necessary to their maintaining credibility in listening areas—operate in a manner not inconsistent with U.S. foreign policy?

Should not European countries pay a substantial part of the cost of operating the stations?

The five of us respect the views of those who feel that the radios are irritants to the governments of the Soviet Union and Eastern

European countries, and, hence, not harmonious with the spirit of détente which now seems to be developing. We surely applaud every small or major step taken to reduce friction between the two great power centers of the world. However, on the basis of trips several of us have made to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and from the 6-month study we recently completed, we are convinced that by the dissemination of factual information and research-backed interpretations to the peoples of the six countries concerned, we enhance progress toward détente.

Stated differently, we would fear a situation in which the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe knew only what their rigidly controlled mass media permitted them to know. A misinformed or partially informed people could be pawns in the hands of party and governmental leaders. Persons in possession of the facts about world and internal conditions, actions, and aims, on the other hand, do have an influence on leaders, even dictatorial regimes.

I would go so far as to assert this: A major motivation of the Soviet Union in developing better relations with the United States and other Western nations is a response to the expressed desire of her people for higher standards of living, a consuming desire that has gradually developed from their knowledge that human welfare elsewhere is better served and advanced, and that their own current condition need not be inevitable or should not be ignored. Hence, the Soviet Union seeks better trade relations and agreements in the political and military areas which will permit her to emphasize more than ever before production which improves personal well-being of her own people.

As to the next two questions, we believe we have recommended a simple and inexpensive form of Federal organization which can, if the radios are continued, receive Federal appropriations, make allocations to the private corporations, see to it that funds are legally and responsibly used, and—while respecting the independence of the stations in transmitting news and interpretations, both external and internal, and thus maintaining unprecedented credibility—assure the Congress and the people that broadcasts are not inconsistent with American foreign policy.

The details of this are set forth in the report, which the members of the committee have, so I shall not deal with them unless you wish my colleagues and me to discuss this phase of the study after I have dealt with the last of the four points I have mentioned.

The members of the Study Commission feel that we should, through the official channels of our Government, urge European nations to begin providing either public or private funds, possibly both, in support of some aspects of the radios' operations, and the Secretary has just indicated that these negotiations are already underway.

Efforts in this regard can begin and become effective if and when it is known that the radios will be continued until there is, as promised in the Declaration of Human Rights and the constitution of UNESCO, a free flow of information across national boundaries—that information reaching the peoples of one power center of the world is not filtered through systems of control that harmfully distort or withhold the facts.

Efforts to obtain financial help should be, first, in our judgment, in support of the indispensable and accurate research of the two stations, this research costing about \$4 million a year.

May I say that there is no other agency in the world that is doing such substantial and dependable research on areas to which these radios broadcast as are Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, indeed this research material is being used by foreign offices of many of the governments of Western Europe.

We should also seek both foreign and domestic private and public funds to help rebuild the transmitting facilities of the stations, for they are rapidly becoming obsolete, overpowered by scores of other stations. This cost will be large, perhaps \$30 million.

But we do not favor foreign financial help in support of daily broadcasting. U.S. experiences in many international organizations demonstrate how time consuming it is to get agreement in a multinational effort. In the editorial field, such as in preparing UNESCO publications, texts may be edited and reedited until they meet the objections of all, and the final result may be bland and meaningless. In the rapid fire task of daily broadcasting, multinational control with the inevitable delays and compromises would be fatal.

Indeed, a great strength of RFE and RL is that they usually reach their audiences with both world and internal news and interpretations before the centralized censoring bureaucracy has released the governmentally sanitized versions. This causes increased listenership and enhances credibility for RFE and RL. Furthermore, despite all the criticism of the United States heard abroad, I am convinced, from three personal visits to the Soviet Union, that our country is more highly respected by the listeners than is any other nation. Hosts of them are grateful to us for helping them learn about the actual conditions that affect personal well-being and international relationships.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a personal statement which I have not checked with my colleagues, though there is a very brief reference in this regard in our report.

In my visits with a number of Senators, I gained the impression that the problem of financing the two radios is caught in a much larger issue. Many Senators and many of us in private life are chagrined, even angry, by the failure of the European nations to meet fully their obligations in support of Western security. Only one nation in Europe has lived up to its commitments in the NATO complex. The United States continues to carry a disproportionate share of the cost, even at a time when Europe can afford to do more, our present cost approaching \$17 billion a year.

Hence many favor an immediate and unilateral reduction of our European expenditures. I would feel the same were it not for my earnest hope that in the military force reduction talks now underway we can achieve agreement for reductions by all Western and Eastern powers. If that happy result is achieved, I would hope that reductions by the United States would be greater percentagewise than those made by most European governments. We would then have a more equitable situation.

It is an unhappy circumstance I think to have the problem of the radios involved in this larger issue. The Soviet Union and nations within her hegemony, even in working for détente, have made clear their intention to intensify the ideological struggle. They speak to the world in more than 4,000 program hours each week—in 84 languages by the Soviet Union alone.

Of this total, 250 program hours a week are beamed to North America in English and a variety of foreign languages used by ethnic groups in the United States; this seems wasteful, since our free press carries nearly everything the Soviet Union and her satellites say or do. All of the Western powers combined, speak to the world, including some programs to the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union, about 4,200 program hours a week.

Only Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are beamed exclusively to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, for a total, respectively, of 566 and 579 program hours a week. Essential as are the Voice of America, BBC, French, and other radios which present the official views of their governments, there can be no doubt that in this whole complex of broadcasting, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are indeed unique, and in my view the most effective in reaching the power center with which the United States must find accommodation.

An informed people, I am convinced, will work for that accommodation, for lasting détente. The cost of the radios is about one-third of 1 percent of other U.S. costs in Europe. If an informed people succeed in inspiring their governments to enter into mutual force reductions, the radios each year could pay for themselves, perhaps a hundredfold.

In the report submitted to you, you will find 14 examples of the effectiveness of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in reaching listeners with the type of information that surely is a cumulative inducement to détente. These were selected from hundreds that could be cited. I commend them to you. They are on pages 30 to 36 of our report.

Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations I was asked to prepare a formal statement on jamming by the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries, its cost and its effectiveness which I did after the hearings were concluded. I submitted it for the record there and I also gave a copy to your committee thinking it may be of interest and for inclusion in the record.

Chairman MORGAN. Without objection the document will be made part of the permanent record.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT BY DR. MILTON S. EISENHOWER ON JAMMING

COST OF JAMMING

I am informed by the Department of State that some estimates of the annual cost of jamming by the Soviet Union and some East European states have run close to \$200 million—one as high as \$300 million. However, it is generally agreed that no close estimate is possible because of many variables or unknowns—the number of high-powered transmitters actually in use, the number of small, so-called “ground-wave” jammers which are effective over short distances in metropolitan areas, the size and pay-levels of operating staff, etc.

Nevertheless, I am informed that radio engineers close to the problem are quite sure that total jamming costs run higher than the cost of U.S. international broadcasting—that is, of the Voice of America, RFE and Radio Liberty. In terms of the amount of U.S. broadcasting against which the jamming is directed—a small proportion of the total VOA output, somewhat more than half of RFE broadcasts, and all of Radio Liberty—the jamming effort would cost considerably more. In terms of the proportion of the Soviet Union's Gross National Product put into this effort, it is again higher.

As one yardstick of dollar cost, I note that Mr. Richard Helms, former Director of the CIA, told this Committee last February 5 that the cost to the

Soviet Union of jamming RFE was "more than twice what RFE costs," this would make it upward of \$50 millions.

As another way of measuring the effort, engineers conversant with jamming point out that it requires from three to six large long-distance transmitters to jam a single broadcast transmitter to any real effect, and that for greater effectiveness these have to be supplemented by at least one ground-wave jammer in each population center—that is, 7 or more even in a small country like Czechoslovakia.

EXTENT OF JAMMING

The Soviet Union jams Radio Liberty, as it has since the station first went on the air. It currently jams all Voice of America broadcasts to the Soviet Union except those in the Baltic languages.

The Bulgarian broadcasts of both Radio Free Europe and VOA are jammed.

Czechoslovak and Polish broadcasts of RFE are jammed. Jamming of Polish broadcasts stopped in 1956, after the Poznan riots and Golumka's accession to power; it was resumed by degrees after the 1970 Baltic Coast demonstrations. In Czechoslovakia jamming completely stopped in the late stages of the 1968 "Prague Spring," but was resumed after the Warsaw Pact invasion; it is as heavy today as at any time in the past.

Hungary gave up jamming in 1964, and Romania in 1963.

EFFECTIVENESS

There is no question but that jamming discourages regular listening by many people who would otherwise be glad to receive information from the stations concerned. Conversely, it is almost impossible for jammers to deprive a determined listener from hearing a given broadcaster if he is willing to wait for the most favorable time of day, to test out various frequencies until he finds the one least jammed in his locale, or if necessary to go out to the suburbs or the country to escape the concentrated jamming in metropolitan areas.

Fortunately, however, it is not generally that difficult. Radio Liberty (and of course the Voice of America) have millions of listeners in the Soviet Union. And Radio Free Europe has millions also in its listening areas—in the jammed areas as well as the unjammed.

The case of RFE is interesting. In Hungary it is entirely unjammed, and its most recent audience studies indicate a listenership of 53% of the population over age 14. In Czechoslovakia, where RFE is most heavily jammed, it still maintains a listenership of 35% of those over 14. However, in terms of frequent listenership, there is a wider disparity—undoubtedly due to the difficulty of listening. In Hungary, three out of five of those who listen to RFE at all are frequent listeners—that is, they tune in daily or several times a week. But in Czechoslovakia, about one out of three RFE listeners tunes in frequently. (Even so, I might add, this means a frequent listenership in Czechoslovakia of one-and-a-third millions, in a country with a considerably smaller population than California or New York.)

REASON FOR THE JAMMING EFFORT

I have been asked to analyze why the Soviet Union (and I might add, some East European countries) exert such an effort to blot out most American-sponsored broadcasts. I think Leonid Brezhnev gave the reason for that very succinctly in his speech to the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee two months ago, on April 26. As quoted by *Pravda*, Mr. Brezhnev said that "favorable conditions have been created in the development of peaceful collaboration among the countries of Europe." But he also said:

"The most important trend in the foreign-policy work of the Soviet Communist Party is the struggle to strengthen the positions of world socialism . . ."

And the *Pravda* report added:

"The Plenum . . . devoted attention to the necessity for constant vigilance and readiness to give a rebuff to the intrigues of the aggressive imperialist circles, and for consistent struggle against reactionary ideology propaganda . . ."

What the Soviet program calls for—as they make clear not only by jamming but by close control of all media, of travel, and even of publication of Soviet works abroad which might leak back into the country—is as airtight a monopoly as possible over what goes into the minds of their citizens and, so far as their powers of persuasion go, the citizens of their allies. The Romanian and Hungarian lead-

erships apparently feel that they can control the situation sufficiently by shaping the internal flow of information, and accept the handicap of unjammed information from outside rather than accentuate its importance by trying to blot it out—especially since the blotting-out effort would only be partially successful.

How far the Soviet Union is willing to go in this blotting-out effort was illustrated just last weekend.

Throughout the visit to the United States of Mr. Brezhnev, the jamming of Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America continued unchanged in pattern or intensity—with one exception: When the Voice of America made a live broadcast of Mr. Brezhnev's June 24 radio speech, it went through wholly unjammed. But this was a special broadcast, outside the Voice's normal broadcast schedule to the USSR. The regularly scheduled VOA Russian-language programs preceding and following it were jammed as usual—even though they contained reports on Mr. Brezhnev's trip.

PROSPECTS FOR A CHANGE

I have been asked whether I feel that over a period of time the jamming activity might be lessened, as the leaders concerned realize either the futility of it or the desirability of having people know more, and having the right to know.

I would have to say that I have no basis for making firm predictions. It is possible that more of the East European leaderships will come to feel, like the Hungarian and Romanian leaders, that continued jamming is not effective enough to justify the cost and the tacit admission it involves: that they are afraid of the competition of information from outside. But I would hesitate to predict when or where this might happen.

As to their recognizing the desirability of their people having more information, particularly more information from sources outside their control, I hope and trust that it will happen someday, but I am not sanguine about its happening—particularly in the Soviet Union or any East European country closely tied to it—for some years to come.

On this broader point, of a basic change of philosophy, I would like to quote from the Presidential Study Commission's report (page 29-30):

"The Commission has also addressed itself to the question of how long RFE and RL must or should continue. It is our judgment that until the Soviet Union and East European countries change their attitudes and permit a free flow of truthful information, it is in the interests of the United States for the stations to continue. It may be envisioned that one or the other of the RFE audience countries will progress in its relaxation policy to such a degree as to permit discontinuation of broadcasts in that country's language. Such a change in the Soviet Union is probably more remote. The Commission feels that plans for the stations should be of a long-range nature..."

Mr. EISENHOWER. May I make one final informal comment, Mr. Chairman. We took this assignment very seriously. All of us had been opposed before we began the study to the precipitate discontinuance of these radios without a thorough study of their effectiveness, and whether indeed they were helping toward détente or whether they were merely a relic of the cold war.

We not only studied the hearings of the House committee and the Senate committee of the previous year, we studied the two research reports by the Research Division of the Congressional Library, the report of the General Accounting Office—which I may say gave the radios a clean bill of health on their financial management of funds—and then we went to Munich and spent a good deal of time studying the research, the program preparation, the preauditing, the postauditing of programs, and we were especially interested in the actual voicing of the programs to make sure that the programs are free of polemics, free of attacks on individuals, sticking to the truth and the research-based interpretation of that truth, both with respect to their internal and external affairs.

Fifty percent of their programs are based on developments within the Communist nations themselves, as well as cross-reporting these developments between nations.

We came away from that study completely satisfied. So the report that we submit to you comes to you with our unanimous judgment, and I may say our enthusiastic approval.

Thank you gentlemen very much.

Chairman MORGAN. Thank you, Dr. Eisenhower.

Mr. Barrett, Ambassador Gronouski, Ambassador Gullion, and Mr. Roche: We have four vacant chairs at the witness table. Would you please move up to them. There might be some questions to be directed to you by members.

Dr. Eisenhower, for fiscal year 1973 the Congress authorized and appropriated \$39,670,000 to support the operations for the radio stations Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. This year, in the bill that I introduced at the request of the executive, and which includes the Commission's recommendations, the amount proposed is \$50,300,000 for fiscal year 1974. This would be a \$10,630,000 increase in the authorization level from last year.

I understand from reading the Commission report that this increase is not going to provide for expansion in the operations of the two stations nor increase in personnel or new equipment. What basically did the Commission find was the reason for an increased funding request?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Mr. Chairman, our Commission is not expert on the actual financing as are the State Department and the presidents of RFE and RL, but in general let me say this, that devaluation has had an enormous effect upon the cost of operating these radios. A high percentage of the personnel is in Europe, particularly in Munich. Further, the amount previously appropriated was so small that many of the things that ought to be done could not be done. The \$50 million essentially would simply restore the radios in the light of devaluation and increased inflation in Europe to about what they were 2 years ago.

Chairman MORGAN. Dr. Eisenhower, did the Commission give any study to a possible merger of the two stations into one organization?

Mr. EISENHOWER. We did indeed, Mr. Chairman, and there is much to be said for this. If the stations had assurance that they were going to be continued until there is a free flow of information among nations, in which case the stations would be unnecessary—if we knew that these stations were going to operate for another 8 to 10 years—this should be done, but it would cost about \$14 million to bring the two stations together. The studios are separated in the city of Munich. To build or obtain a single building in the light of costs over there, our very best estimate based upon careful studies by the two radios would cost a capital outlay immediately of about \$14 million.

During the course of our study we worked with the two radios in bringing about as much cooperation and consolidation as possible. For example, they have gone a long ways toward consolidating their news services, they exchange research information so that there is no duplication in research, and they cooperate in all other ways that can be done short of that actual move in Munich.

One other problem has some bearing on this question. If a new corporation is formed for any purpose, including a consolidated one,

we would have to renegotiate the licenses in Germany, Spain, Portugal, and Taiwan. There is no question now about the continuation of present licenses, but at this stage we would just as soon avoid the question of applying for new licenses.

But eventually, to answer your question—I have taken too long—it would be feasible and the expenditure for consolidation would be worthwhile if we knew these stations were going to operate over a period of years.

Chairman MORGAN. Dr. Eisenhower, I have one further question. On page 4 of your statement you mentioned that we should be looking forward to some aid from the European countries in helping with the financial structure. Last year this committee met informally with Under Secretary Johnson, and with a group of Europeans headed by Dirk Stikker, former Secretary General of NATO. They said that a real effort would be made to elicit some contribution in the future from European governments and private European sources. Did the Commission go into the possibility of any contributions? Can we expect any contributions in the future to help reduce our cost burden for these two radio stations?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Our authority to do this, Mr. Chairman, was somewhat limited. We are a temporary agency, and it is really the function of the State Department to carry on negotiations with foreign governments. However, we met with Mr. Van Roijen, who is the new chairman of the European committee that now serves both RFE and RL, whereas the old one served only Radio Free Europe. Also there was held in Monaco a conference on this very question.

Again, I think if the European nations and those who might provide private or public funds have assurance that this is an undertaking that we earnestly believe in and will continue for a period of years, substantial public and private funds can be obtained—public funds particularly for the costly research and perhaps both public and private funds in Europe, and private funds to contribute toward the rather large expenditure the stations face in rebuilding the technical equipment, their estimates ranging up to \$30 million.

As I have said in my formal statement, we have serious doubts about multinational financing and, therefore, multinational control of rapid fire daily broadcasting.

Chairman MORGAN. Dr. Eisenhower, it has been alleged in the press and by some Members of Congress that these two radio stations are now a relic of the cold war. Did your study commission become fully convinced that this is not the case, that they are still needed?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Yes. Those who say this are around 15 to 20 years out of date. When Radio Free Europe started in 1950, and Radio Liberty in 1951, I think it is true to say that with the cold war at its height when it started in the Truman administration, and to some extent is not quite dead, that there were elements of cold war emphasis. In fact, I experienced this myself when I was in the Soviet Union with Vice President Nixon in 1959. But I can assure you that there is no trace of cold war behavior, tone of voice, polemics, or anything else in them today.

In bringing international news and interpretation to the Soviet bloc, they tell both the good and the bad about what is going on in the United States and in the Free World. Only by doing this do they retain and build their credibility. On their cross-reporting within the Soviet

Union and the five eastern countries, which constitutes 50 percent of their broadcasting, they are meticulously careful. They check the news that comes to them daily with their research people who devote full time to promoting accuracy. After all, it is not by accident that Solzhenitsyn said, "If we ever hear anything about events in this country, it is through them," Radio Liberty broadcasts.

Now I read in a local paper that BBC is more influential. May I say that was the voice of one man. We studied evidence based upon interviews with 1,600 people from the Soviet Union on trips outside the Soviet Union and are convinced that Radio Liberty—and Radio Free Europe in East Europe—are the most influential ones. In fact, I talked personally to two recent emigres from the heart of a jamming area—Moscow. By putting their radio antenna out the kitchen window, they would receive RL, and they said this was the only way they could learn the truth of what was going on, both in the world and in their own country.

Chairman MORGAN. Thank you, Dr. Eisenhower.

I am impressed with the Commission's study. I think you have done an excellent job. I want to congratulate the members who are here today, who have been very convincing. I believe that the President showed wisdom in following the suggestion, originated in the committee by Congressman Fascell of Florida, for a study commission. I think it has been excellent and I hope it will help us on the floor during the debate.

Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join the chairman in expressing my compliments to the Commission. The report is most interesting, and I think it will be helpful to us.

A couple of questions that I would like to ask, and I don't care who answers them.

Is there any indication that jamming activity in the Soviet Union or the Eastern European countries is declining at all now that other relationships are at least apparently improving?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I would like to share this microphone with my colleagues, but I will take a stab at this.

In the Soviet Union, despite jamming, our best estimate is that about 10 percent of the people regularly listen to Radio Liberty, but the actual audience is much greater than that. Sometimes right in the heart of the jamming area they can be heard—also students, intellectuals, and others have learned that by going out to the periphery of the city they can hear Radio Liberty with clarity. They tape record programs, make typed scripts from the recording, and pass them among their friends.

The underground method of transmitting information in a controlled society is absolutely astounding to me, I have experienced it myself three times.

Now two countries in Eastern Europe, as I recall, have stopped all jamming. The other three to which Radio Free Europe broadcasts do continue jamming. It is, of course, somewhat effective, but not effective enough to stop the effectiveness of the radios. Interestingly, the more they jam the more the people become curious as to what their government is trying to prevent them from hearing.

Now maybe some of my colleagues would like to add to what I have said.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN A. GRONOUSKI, DEAN, LYNDON B. JOHNSON SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I would like to make two observations. One, if anything it has gone up rather than down in the last few years from all the evidence I can gather, so that there has not been the diminution that one would hope for in the jamming activity.

Second, one of the things that we who believe the radios are very effective and useful are concerned about is that over the years the effectiveness of our equipment as compared to their jamming equipment is diminishing. It is critically important that we concern ourselves with updating and revitalizing the equipment over time if the jamming is going to be as ineffective as we hope it will be over time.

Mr. MAILLIARD. That leads obviously to another question that I am sure is going to be asked, so I would like to get the answer on the record. How much confidence can we place in our ability to really estimate the listening audience?

Mr. EISENHOWER. The estimates with respect to Radio Free Europe are exceedingly good. They are based upon interviews by independent interviewing agencies with visitors to the West from the five nations of East Europe. Visitors from these countries are much freer to talk than those who come out from the Soviet Union.

Here we are satisfied and, by the way, this was verified by the research study conducted by the Research Division of the Library of Congress that our listening audience ranges about 50 percent of the population over 14 years in age.

A very interesting thing took place in Czechoslovakia. Before the great movement under Dubcek started, the listening audience was 50, 55, 60 percent. As the Dubcek leadership instituted a free press RFE listenership dropped to 37 percent, but as soon as that regime was driven from power listenership quickly went back up to something like 60 or 65 percent.

Now that information I think is very reliable. The information with respect to the Soviet Union is much more difficult to obtain, but there are many emigres to Israel who have been interviewed and other methods have been used. If you want a detailed answer, I think that Mr. Howland Sargeant, president of Radio Liberty, could be more specific than I, unless one of my colleagues can give you a more specific answer.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I just want to suggest that during my little stint of 3 years in Poland, where I traveled throughout the country every weekend, I was just absolutely amazed by the widespread listenership of RFE. I had no experience with Radio Liberty. I don't think there was ever a time that I took a trip out of town that someone didn't give me a bit of information or news that came from Radio Free Europe. I would say that combining the actual listenership and the passing on of information from those who listened to others, a pretty high percentage of the Polish people received information through RFE.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. By the way, let me just add that when I came into Poland—when I went over there as Ambassador, I decided to

come in by train because I wanted to cut across some of the Eastern European countries, which was a rather good experience in itself, by the way. There were over 1,500 people at 7 a.m. at the railroad station waiting for me, and the only advance news of my trip had been broadcast by Radio Free Europe.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Secretary.

Mr. STOESEL. I was only going to say, my experience as Ambassador to Poland for 4 years, confirms what Mr. Gronouski has said. The listenership is indeed enormous. It goes up in times of crisis, as Dr. Eisenhower indicated was the case in Czechoslovakia. During the period of the riots in Poland in December of 1970 I think we were estimating about 90 percent of the people of Poland were getting their information about what was going on in their own country through RFE. It was a very remarkable performance.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Zablocki.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to welcome the distinguished witnesses before us this morning, Mr. Chairman. I want to also commend and congratulate Dr. Eisenhower and his team on the study of the Commission of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

To pursue further the question of my colleague from California as to the value of Radio Free Europe and the engaging of listener response, particularly in the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe, it is my understanding that a recent Ph. D. dissertation submitted to Johns Hopkins University by Dr. Maury Lisann is revealing in many respects. It was entitled "The Politics of Broadcasting To the U.S.S.R.," and contained, I believe, some rather original research about listener polls conducted within the Soviet Union by the Soviets themselves. I wonder if you have any comment on the research and radio listeners' response in particular?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I have very hastily read that rather massive research report which was prepared as a Ph. D. thesis at the Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and it most assuredly supports what we have been saying about the effectiveness of the radios.

Another piece of information in that document is impressive to me. Station reporting of internal developments, which their governments had been withholding, has compelled them to change their policy somewhat and provide their own sanitized version of those events. This indicates that they know their people are listening to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I may say this is getting to be a fairly regular situation.

When Sadat ejected the Soviets from Egypt there was a long silence by their censored, controlled information media. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty reported immediately, factually, coolly, with no emotion. About 48 hours later they gave their version. Then the fact that the head theorist, whose name I don't recall at the moment, found it necessary to issue a long justification for what they had done in Czechoslovakia—yes, Suslov—indicates that they knew their people were getting information from the outside about the Czechoslovakian situation and what the world thought about it.

So there is much evidence that one could keep on citing to show that despite the rather small, say 10 percent, initial listening audience in

the U.S.S.R. that the news and the facts spread like a prairie fire throughout the country.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the Commission has considered several organizational options for meeting the objectives of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and recommends the provisions of H.R. 8144 which authorizes the Board for International Broadcasting. In your report, on page 50, you state the Commission's belief that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, while respecting the sensitivities of the other nations and soliciting their views, should not be subjected to multigovernment control. However, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty projects are cooperative efforts with the United States and certain allies participating—what is their role?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I am not sure I understand that question, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is my understanding that our Western allies are participating and assisting in Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty projects. However, if the administrative structure is to be solely in the United States through the Board for International Broadcasting, what role do the Western allies play in the cooperative effort?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Well, they have not yet told us. The State Department is now in the process of negotiating with them. Our discussions with Dr. Van Roijen, who is now the chairman of their advisory committee, indicates that they will have no difficulty, they think, in supporting research, either by direct grants to the stations or by other means.

I suppose one could foresee—again, if these radios are going to be in existence for a great many years—creation of a new international corporation or foundation to which all governments that wish to make contributions can do so for the exclusive purpose of supporting the radios. What we want to avoid is changing the corporate structure of the two private radios in order not to raise the licensing question that I mentioned earlier.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. But the Commission did look into this probability and possibility?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Yes; we did.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Now to come to the Board itself, it provides for membership of seven with two members ex officio, and five voting members appointed by the President. It also provides that not more than three of the five members of the Board appointed by the President shall be of the same political party. What is the justification or reasoning for that provision?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Well, you mean just for the latter one about the——

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The latter one.

Mr. EISENHOWER. That is fairly standard practice in establishing Federal commissions. Our main concern, as stated in the report, is that the President appoint persons who are distinguished in the fields of foreign policy and mass communications. The political provision is simply because it is standard in setting up commissions like the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and all others.

May I go on, because your question implies something else? I am certainly not one to remind you that the Congress never appropriates

directly to a private corporation. It always appropriates to a public agency which it can control through many processes, and that executive agency then makes grants to private agencies. This is common practice in the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Defense Department, and others in making grants to universities, private research agencies, and even industry. So we had to find an appropriate Federal agency that could receive the funds from the Congress, be responsible to the President and the Congress for the judicious use of that money, rather than appropriations going directly to the private corporations.

But we feel strongly that the private corporations must operate the radios because only they can do so as a surrogate free press, which is the essence of what gives them the credibility they have. Straight Government operation of these radios would be obliged to report the official policy of the United States.

May I say, sir, that while I think BBC and the Voice of America and French broadcasts are quite useful, nonetheless they come to the people as the voices of their governments. Therefore, I am convinced that their credibility is different from the credibility of these two stations.

So the question was what kind of an agency can be developed that would appropriately receive money from the Congress and then make grants and see to it that the money is properly spent.

After studying every possible alternative we came up with the suggestion to form what amounts to a five-member board appointed by the President, plus two ex-officio nonvoting members who would be the chief executive officers of the two private corporations, the reasons for their presence being we would not want the board to operate without the most intimate day-by-day knowledge, or whenever they met, of what is actually going on.

Further by having the two chief executives meeting with as members, nonvoting members, of the board they will understand the policies of that board and therefore faithfully carry them out.

Finally, the two private corporations, with headquarters in New York, have administrative personnel which need not be duplicated by the new board we have recommended. We therefore think that the cost of the new board, with very few employees, will be minimal.

Now I have gone way beyond your question, sir, but I thought these facts ought to be made clear.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to join in welcoming all these witnesses here. I hope the ones who have been silent won't feel they should remain silent. I think we would like to hear from all of you.

It is a particular pleasure for me to see Dr. Eisenhower and to hear him testify so eloquently. I came down to Washington in January 1953 so the Eisenhower name rings a special bell in my own mind.

I would like to follow up on the suggestion that help from Europe is likely and advisable. I would guess from the report that you don't think that there is any great likelihood of getting any substantial assistance in the near future. On page 50 you referred to developments in 1972 which reflect a reluctance by Western European governments

to consider financial aid to the stations even though these governments recognize the valuable role played by their broadcasts.

I would think this is realistic appraisal. If this is our show, why should others provide substantial assistance? I would think it unlikely that they are going to make a substantial contribution either to research or to new facilities. What worries me, if you hold this out as a possibility, is whether you are creating an expectation that Europe owes us something in support of these stations. I would think it is almost better not to expect substantial support and to recognize it is in our interest to provide this money ourselves. The same thing could be said—about domestic efforts to raise money.

You say that Radio Free Europe has in the past received some private assistance. I would think there is precious little likelihood of generating any substantial support privately if it is known that we are providing \$40 or \$50 million of taxpayers' money. What is the incentive either in Europe or in this country to provide assistance?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I very much appreciate your statement. Certainly we do not expect, and so say in the report, that there would be substantial European financial help. First, we don't think there should be any government participation in programing decisions for the reasons I have stated. I am not pessimistic about getting assistance for research. That research has no direct relation to daily broadcasting policy decisions. It is supportive of daily broadcasting.

I think that in the discussions by the State Department abroad there is hope, but here we are talking about a few million dollars. As to the \$30 million cost of rebuilding the stations—the technical equipment which must be obtained—we have hoped, and so say in the report, that 50 percent of that would be provided by the U.S. Government over a period of 3 or 4 years, and the other half raised in Europe and in the United States. Radio Free Europe over a period of years did conduct a campaign nationally in getting private funds, and, as I recall, about 18 percent of its support came from private sources.

Unfortunately, in Europe they do not have many foundations or tax reduction for gifts. This is an American institution, so it is not as easy to raise money in Europe.

I agree with you, sir, that we would not want to raise the hopes of the Congress or have it now act affirmatively on this legislation in the belief that the amount of aid to be achieved from other sources will take up a substantial portion of the cost. We don't think it will, but we do think we can get help for research and we think we could carry out the program on equipment that we have recommended.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD BARRETT, DIRECTOR, COMMUNICATIONS INSTITUTE, ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BARRETT. I would just like to supplement that. I have done a good deal of work in the entire national information field, and I have worked on joint publications through UNESCO, have helped on some U.N. projects, once ran the allied forces radio out of General Eisenhower's headquarters in Algiers and so on. I can say that any time that you have to run an information operation that is subject to control by a multiplicity of nations you really start running into editorial

problems and you do produce or are likely to produce a kind of ultra blandness that Chairman Eisenhower referred to.

For that reason I was one of those who most strongly urged against trying to get support from many nations for the broadcasting as opposed to the research. I believe, as our Chairman said, that we can get substantial and increasing support for the research side and that it would be unwise to try to get multiple national financing on the general operational side. Yet, in view of the plaudits that have come from many other nations for the work of these two radios, this can be used by our State Department friends as sort of a bargaining point in other negotiations regarding joint finance: "After all we are paying the whole operating cost of these radios which you gentlemen have applauded, and that should be taken into consideration."

Thank you, sir.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Could I ask what was the Commission's recommendation with respect to the financing of facilities? The report, on page 52, says that the President should recommend an appropriation to provide 50 percent of the required funds and the radios are to conduct a campaign to raise a like amount from private citizens and the business community.

As I read it that is a domestic campaign, not a campaign in Europe. Or is it both?

Mr. EISENHOWER. No, if you read the text completely, you will see it was certainly our intention that efforts should be made to raise money in Europe too.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This language is under the section entitled, "Private contributions in the United States," so it clearly indicates that we are trying to raise money domestically.

Mr. EISENHOWER. I am sorry, there must be a statement someplace else because I am very clear in my mind that we fully expect to try to raise money for the other half of the cost of equipment also in Europe.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Eisenhower, I wonder if you had occasion to see the article in the Washington Post, July 28, by Robert G. Kaiser from Moscow entitled "The Impact of U.S. Radio Abroad."

[The newspaper article follows:]

[From the Washington Post, Saturday, July 28, 1973]

THE IMPACT OF U.S. RADIO ABROAD

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

MOSCOW.—It is now customary to hold an annual debate in Washington about Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, two products of the cold war, both financed for years by the CIA, which broadcast news and commentary to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The debate is stirring, if somewhat repetitive. The stations' defenders invoke the "right to know" and other good causes; their opponents call the stations outdated, unnecessary and expensive.

From here, neither side's arguments sound very persuasive. The proponents sound too enthusiastic, and the opponents too categorical. The debate seems mired in slogans that don't really apply to the facts of life in this part of the world.

Those who defend Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe trade widely on the notion that these are the only stations broadcasting "the truth" to citizens of the

Communist countries. In fact, they are only two of perhaps a dozen stations and probably not the most popular two.

One Russian who depends on foreign radio for his news of the world suggested the other day that for Moscow intellectuals, the British Broadcasting Corporation's Russian service is by far the most popular. He ranked the West German radio second, the Voice of America third, and Radio Liberty fourth.

The situation is similar in East Europe. No doubt, RFE (which broadcasts only to the satellites, leaving the U.S.S.R. to Radio Liberty) has a big audience in the region. But intellectuals seem to like the BBC better. In Hungary, Austrian stations have enormous audiences. In Poland, German stations attract thousands of listeners. The VOA is popular everywhere.

The latest elaborate defense of RFE and Radio Liberty comes from a commission appointed by President Nixon under the chairmanship of Milton S. Eisenhower. Its report is a good example of the tendency to exaggerate the specific importance of RFE and Radio Liberty.

The committee chose "the right to know" as the title for its report and proceeded to credit Liberty and RFE with virtually every embarrassing fact to penetrate the Iron Curtain in recent years. In a section called "Samples of Effectiveness," the Eisenhower committee lists 14 instances in which, it says, these two stations provided news or information that Communist media were trying to hide or delay.

One of the examples was a personal testimonial from an emigre. The 13 others were all straightforward news stories which were broadcast behind the Iron Curtain by numerous Western stations, from the BBC to Israeli radio.

RFE and Radio Liberty stations do not provide an invaluable broadcast service. They do provide news and opinion that differs vastly from the official line, and sometimes differs from the BBC, too. To the extent that the United States wants to subsidize multiple sources of information for the citizens of Communist countries, the stations are useful.

Liberty and Free Europe devote an unusual amount of attention to the domestic affairs of the country to which they broadcast. Other stations cover domestic stories in the Communist countries, but RFE and Liberty invest a great part of their resources in this effort. They maintain large research staffs which read the Communist newspapers, monitor radio broadcasts and exploit clandestine sources for information that might otherwise pass unnoticed.

This research contributes to their broadcasts and helps scholars and journalists who are trying to follow Communist affairs.

But the difficulty—in this era of détente—is that both stations are regarded as implacably hostile in the Soviet Union and its empire. Painful as it may be to acknowledge, this reputation was well earned. For years, Radio Free Europe did act as an organ for anti-government and anti-Communist forces that hoped to overthrow the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe. RFE did help incite Hungarians to revolt in 1956, with consequences too well known.

Radio Liberty has also broadcast provocative programs, often prepared by Russian emigres, which the regime here interpreted as direct challenges to its authority. Many Soviet intellectuals, including some active in the dissident movement in recent years, accept the official definition of Radio Liberty as an "enemy" organization. Some prominent dissidents are upset when their petitions or articles are read on Liberty broadcasts. They fear reprisals.

For many years, these stations pretended to be financed by public donations, when in fact the CIA was providing most of the money. Not surprisingly, Communist regimes tend to regard the CIA as an implacable enemy.

Now, the Eisenhower commission and its allies promise, the stations are taking new precautions, imposing strict standards, avoiding all provocations. Perhaps so, although the Eisenhower report acknowledged "occasional aberrations from policy guidelines" in the past.

Even if a new leaf is turned, however, the two stations are tainted by their names, and to some extent by their emigre personnel—both holdovers from the period when they earned their bad reputations. It may be time for a change.

This doesn't mean the United States has to give up its information programs to the Communist countries. Despite their noble protests, the Communists are as actively engaged in propaganda as ever, and the intention of their propaganda often is to distort or hide what Americans regard as the truth. Foreign radio broadcasts have been a positive influence throughout the Communist world, and millions of people depend on them for objective facts—about international affairs and their own countries.

But the benefits of shortwave broadcasts to the Communist countries can be preserved without maintaining Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe in their

traditional form. Indeed, a fundamental reorganization of the stations, giving them new names, new personnel and new outlooks, could increase their audiences. Their old reputations obviously detract from their appeal now.

The RFE and Liberty research offices in Munich could be preserved. The material they produce could be shared with all the Western stations broadcasting to Communist countries. To save money, reorganized stations could operate on a more modest scale than RFE and Liberty do now. Radio Liberty broadcasts 24 hours a day, more than any domestic Soviet station.

Changes along these lines could be an effective demonstration to the Soviet Union of just what the United States understands détente to mean. America can admit past excesses and demonstrate a desire to restructure relations in a new spirit, without abandoning traditional attitudes toward censorship and falsification in the Communist countries.

The Russians know that they distort information, or hide it altogether in their own news media and propaganda abroad. It isn't in America's interest to acquiesce quietly to this policy of misinformation. But surely there are new ways to demonstrate America's unwillingness to acquiesce—new ways that are more compatible with the new atmosphere in international relations.

Mr. EISENHOWER. I saw it just this morning.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Kaiser, whom I know to be a well respected journalist, makes some telling points in criticism of your proposal. I wonder if either you or one of your colleagues would want to respond to his comments?

Mr. EISENHOWER. He thought we were being a little too enthusiastic and exuberant. He based his article on an interview with one intellectual of the Soviet Union. I can simply say to you, sir, that on the basis of my own interviews with a great many people and studying the evidence over a period of years, including the research reports by the Library of Congress, that he does not take into account the difference between BBC and these two radios. It is true that BBC will broadcast the straight news and possibly some interpretation of the news which these two stations also do, but only these two stations do one thing which is tremendously effective, namely cross-reporting developments within the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries, domestic news that they are withholding from their people which RFE and RL learn about by a number of methods: one, by monitoring of their local stations, second, by getting 175 of their newspapers; third, from correspondents who come out of the Communist countries—reliable correspondents who report to us, and, finally, by a relatively new source called "samizdat," or self-publication.

RL now has more than 2,000 samizdat documents in their files. The radios broadcast these. So Soviet citizens are thus speaking back to the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. So really there is no comparison to be made between the official voices of the free world governments and these two private corporations. The latter are restricted only in one way: they must operate within American foreign policy objectives; but otherwise, they operate just like the New York Times or the Washington Post.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I want to come to that in a minute but I am intrigued by some of the specifics. One generality he says, and I quote, "The latest elaborate defense of RFE and Radio Liberty comes from a commission appointed by President Nixon under the chairmanship of Milton S. Eisenhower. Its report is a good example of the tendency to exaggerate the specific importance of RFE and Radio Liberty."

Then in support of that contention he says Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty stations do not provide an invaluable broadcast service,

but rather a different kind of news and opinion service from the official broadcasting services of VOA and BBC.

After noting earlier "aberrations from policy guidelines," as noted by the Eisenhower Commission, Mr. Kaiser says:

Even if a new leaf is turned, however, the two stations are tainted by their names and to some extent by the emigre personnel—both holdovers from the period when they earned their bad reputations. It may be time for a change.

It seems to me that he makes an interesting case and I——

Mr. GRONOUSKI. Nobody has made a case yet, I have not heard anything that could be called a case. Tainted by their name? Radio Free Europe in Poland is regarded as the height of credibility in Poland. A big discussion went on in our Commission on whether that name should be changed and I fought any idea of changing it, that name, because I think that name is one of the important things about RFE. I just think that is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me go on to another question.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN P. ROCHE, PROFESSOR OF POLITICS,
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY**

Mr. ROCHE. May I say——

Mr. ROSENTHAL. We do have a time limitation.

Mr. ROCHE. I didn't mean to interrupt.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Go ahead, Mr. Roche.

Mr. ROCHE. I think that there is a very important point that has to be kept in mind here in connection with this whole principle of détente. The Commission like all sound Americans, I think, believes in what we might call symmetrical détente rather than unilateral détente and in a sense the radio stations are part of our effort in the direction of a full freedom of information.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. What is symmetrical détente?

Mr. ROCHE. It works both ways. That is to say for example Mr. Meany is not terribly impressed with the Russian trade union movement that is run by a secret policeman. Now what Radio Liberty does is fascinating.

For example, Fiat was putting in a big factory and were having problems, so they brought in a bunch of Italian Communist trade unionists. They went back to Italy and published an article in a Communist journal in which they said: "We can not understand what is the matter with those Russians. Why don't they get a good union?"

This was in the Communist orbit. This is the kind of thing that Radio Liberty deals with that Voice of America or BBC or stations of that sort don't. In other words there is this vast audience out there and we believe that knowledge in a sense is a freedom of information, is part of something which you gentlemen in another context have talked about as democratic development.

At least I certainly think very strongly this is a good idea. Obviously we don't want any kamikaze operations; that is, we are not trying to start any revolutions or anything of that sort. Nonetheless we feel that this contribution to the information that exists in the muffled zones is one that is very significant to American foreign policy.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I have a whole series of questions and it is going to be difficult to get them out. That one statement that I read from the Kaiser article——

Mr. EISENHOWER. This is based on an interview as I recall with one intellectual. We could match that with dozens that tells us the opposite. For example, in your previous hearings 2 years ago there was a Soviet Ph. D. physicist who succeeded in getting out of the Soviet Union. He pointed out that until he was 19 years old, having listened only to his own controlled mass media, he was prepared to take a gun and shoot in Hungary or Czechoslovakia or against American forces wherever he was asked to. Then, he said, by accident or on the advice of another student, "I began listening to Radio Liberty and I found that my government was lying to me all the time, and I began to learn what was going on in the world and completely changed my mind."

Solzhenitsyn says if we hear anything about events in this country it is through them—he meant Radio Liberty. This was an interview freely given to the New York Times.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me get to the structure and organization which causes me some deep concern. Dr. Eisenhower, you said that essentially this is a private operation except that it should stay within the perimeters of U.S. foreign policy. I think you said something like that.

Mr. EISENHOWER. That is correct.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I have difficulty in understanding why we should devote public financing to a private radio broadcasting.

Mr. EISENHOWER. That is nothing unusual, Congressman. Our Congress is spending billions of dollars in private organizations in this country to achieve public purposes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You referred in your report that this is similar to a free press in the United States. Do we spend funds on a free press?

Mr. EISENHOWER. No. As a matter of fact if the free press in this country were permitted to circulate within the closed societies or if they had their own free press, there would be no reason for these radios. All I am saying is that there is nothing unusual about the Government of the United States spending some of its money, through private corporations, to achieve its purpose, to achieve a Federal governmental purpose.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I think it should be noted that we do spend a little money from public funds on broadcasting in this country.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I have some difficulty understanding why we don't do this in some other areas of the world; for example, in Greece, in Spain, Portugal, North Vietnam, North Korea.

Mr. EISENHOWER. This question has come up a number of times. For example, the first question is about China. Why aren't we doing this in China? There is at least one reason—there are not very many shortwave radio sets in the Chinese People's Republic. However, on the broader question, I don't think any member of this Commission would object whatsoever if the U.S. Government wished to spend the money to see to it that peoples everywhere obtained the truth. After all, we not only have an iron curtain in the world, we have a lot of bamboo and lace curtains behind which people get only part of the truth.

But, after all, we are talking here about the two great power centers of the world. I am sure, sir, that we all agree that if we can reach an accommodation to bring about détente with the other great power cen-

ter that we would have set the stage for a new period in history. I would have no objection, and I don't think any member of the committee would, if we wanted to set up a radio to broadcast to Spain. The Soviet Union has a clandestine station directed exclusively to Spain, it has another directed to Iran, another to Greece. It would be all right if we wanted to spend the money, but we think RFE and RL broadcasts are so imperative that we don't want to waste any of the resources we need to run these two and dissipate money which, by starting new ones might result in underfinancing all of them.

Chairman MORGAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a question for Mr. Gronouski.

John, based on your background as Ambassador, and if I recall correctly, while you served in Poland you made it a point to become familiar with all of Eastern Europe. Just how practical is it at this point to assume that as a result of the recent meetings between the President and Mr. Brezhnev that the ideological struggle would fade away?

I realize this is a key point relating to the existence of these radios, and I would appreciate your addressing yourself to that point.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. Well, I don't think from either side of the fence, their side or ours, the ideological differences are going to disappear overnight—or over a decade. On the other hand, I am very hopeful of accommodation over time between these two sides. That is what the whole bridgebuilding concept is about. It is my very firm conviction that one of the ways that this process of accommodation happens is through the pressure on Governments by the people, and that happens in Eastern Europe as well as in this country, and the only way you get that pressure is to have a people informed about what is going on in their country.

May I just make one final observation. If we are going to move toward détente, if that is our objective—I define détente as an accommodation between two quite different systems, and thus ultimately prevention of world war III, which is what all foreign policy is about—if we are going to move in that direction, we are going to move through the pressure of people who know what is going on in their country as well as around the world.

I say that these radios, by providing that opportunity for popular pressures in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, are absolutely critical in the move toward détente so defined.

Mr. EISENHOWER. May I just add one comment, sir, on your specific question.

Right in the midst of the negotiations that have gone on, Brezhnev made public statements and said that the ideological struggle must be intensified.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I have noted that. Now I have a question for Mr. Roche. As a columnist and, therefore, appreciating the impact of a free press, to what extent do you address yourself to the charge that we often hear that there is limited impact in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union through these radio broadcasts? In other words, what is the real impact on radio listenership, keeping in mind of course the controlled nature of the press there?

Mr. ROCHE. Well, beginning autobiographically, one of the disconcerting things is being congratulated on a column you didn't write. Somebody says "The column you wrote the other day," and it turns out to be by Bob Novak, so within that—

Mr. DERWINSKI. Have you ever been congratulated for a column that Bill Buckley wrote?

Mr. ROCHE. No; I have not hit that pole yet, not in this time frame.

Now as far as the question of impact is concerned, we are obviously dealing, as far as the U.S.S.R. is concerned, with somewhat existential figures, and none of us is prepared to march out on the plank on the basis of the estimates that have been made because it is too hard. On the other hand, what we do have is a very significant body of elite opinion, mainly in Israel—the people who have gotten out over the course of the last couple of years, who are not only in a position to talk about what they themselves did. Also as newspapermen, scientists, or intellectuals, men and women of considerable education, they are in a position to tell about how other people reacted and behaved.

From this information pool it is very clear to me at least that certainly within the Jewish community in the U.S.S.R. and, by hearsay from the Jews, among other minority groups that the work of Radio Liberty is very, very widely received. That is as hard an answer as I can give you.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, can I supplement that?

I agree with the Congressman that Mr. Kaiser is an able young man. In his article he, however, made a number of points that I think are highly debatable. I would like to suggest an answer to that column be supplied for the record. I would be willing to undertake it because there are detailed answers that can be given.

But on your point, sir, I took it upon myself, with my news background, to interview a large number of newspapermen with some familiarity with the Soviet Union and the other Eastern European countries. One of the best informed students of Russia, I happen to think, is Harrison Salisbury, a New York Times associate editor, who also goes back and forth to Russia a great deal. Just as one example, he said to me, "I had reservations about these stations some years ago, but I have studied them, particularly Radio Free Europe, on the scene and am convinced that a good job and a needed job is now being done."

Mr. DERWINSKI. I think our other panelists—

**STATEMENT OF HON. EDMUND A. GULLION, DEAN, FLETCHER
SCHOOL OF LAW AND DIPLOMACY, TUFTS UNIVERSITY**

Mr. GULLION. I was going to speak to the same point which John Roche was making, and also to the Kaiser article in the Post, which most of us have just seen this morning. I have also seen this morning a rather exhaustive analysis of that article prepared, I think, in Radio Liberty, which does repeat a number of the points which were made in our Commission report, but also takes up the more recent allegations or findings of Mr. Kaiser. I find it a very persuasive, well high conclusive reply, and I would hope that that would be put in the record, or that Mr. Sargeant of Radio Liberty might speak to the article this morning.

With respect to the point that Mr. Roche was making about Jewish testimony, Mr. Kaiser said in his article or indicated that many Soviet intellectuals, including some who are active in dissident movements, accept the Soviet official definition of Radio Free Europe as an enemy organization. Some are alleged to be upset when Radio Liberty broadcasts their own samizdat material and they fear reprisals.

This particular analysis, I think prepared by Radio Liberty, recalls the case of 98 Jewish emigres to Israel who addressed a letter to the U.S. Senate in March 1972. They said:

Most of us, the undersigned, just arrived from Russia. We still remember very well those evening hours during which we tried to get and listen to the voice of the free world. Sometimes it was very difficult to catch the voice—the Soviets are doing everything to silence the transmission* * * (Without Radio Liberty) the cold war will increase, because nobody inside Russia will be able to say a word about the real affairs of their government and in a certain measure to influence the little public opinion in their country.

Another emigre said, "They (the Soviet police) can arrest us now, but our testimony will stand in history."

To this particular group, in other words, the name Radio Liberty does not carry those invidious connotations, rather it conveys only good things.

I understand, and we did observe this in Munich, that Radio Liberty is very careful to screen and check on the validity, the bona fides, of statements that reach them from dissident groups because they are aware of the possibility of the actions of agent provocateurs.

Moreover, they wish to keep within the present détente atmosphere and they screen continuously and modify their product according to the evolution of relations between the Soviet Union and the West. So they are very careful of what they put out. This I think brings up another point that had not so far been mentioned, the importance of the samizdat phenomenon with respect to operations of Radio Liberty.

That, as we all know, is the term which means self-publication. This has become another substitute for free press in the Soviet Union and an increasingly important phenomenon. I believe that some 25 percent of Radio Liberty's present broadcasting today is concerned with samizdat material.

This material also furnishes a great research base and the movements of what would be public opinion if, indeed, it were public.

Then, too, this samizdat material is picked up and put on the air, recirculated by Radio Liberty, picked up on wire recorders, tape recorders, recirculated within the Soviet Union, thus getting a great amplifying effect.

Chairman MORGAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Ambassador, without objection that will be made part of the permanent record.

[The material referred to follows:]

PAPER PREPARED BY RFE AND RL PROVIDING INFORMATION OR VIEWPOINTS CONFLICTING WITH STATEMENTS IN "THE IMPACT OF U.S. RADIO ABROAD" BY ROBERT G. KAISER, WASHINGTON POST, JULY 28, 1973

Those who defend Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe trade widely on the notion that these are the only stations broadcasting "the truth" to citizens of the Communist countries. In fact, they are only two of perhaps a dozen stations and probably not the most popular two.

The Study Commission report itself carefully lists the numerous Western international shortwave broadcasters and their total program hours. The Commission report also defines the roles of the broadcasters on page 2 as follows:

"The United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany and other Western nations must rely on radio broadcasting to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union as virtually the only effective means of reaching the peoples there. Official foreign broadcasts, such as those of the Voice of America, are valuable in reporting international news and explaining official governmental positions. These broadcasts serve important purposes and should be continued. "Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are unique in the entire spectrum of international broadcasting. They differ substantially from the official broadcasts of the United States and Western European nations. They operate essentially as a free press does in the United States. They too bring world news and interpretation into the Soviet sphere, but they devote a substantial portion of their broadcasts to news and essential background information about internal developments in and among the communist states."

President Nixon and many other spokesmen on behalf of the radios have also pointed to the unique role of the radios among the many other Western short-wave broadcasters.

At no time have the radios or the Presidential Study Commission or the Department of State contended that RFE and RL are the only stations broadcasting "the truth." The Voice of America, the BBC, Deutsche Welle and a number of other Western stations have audiences in the East, and their broadcasts are truthful. The important distinction is that RFE and RL broadcast in depth about the internal affairs of the countries they reach, and of the Soviet block—in far greater depth and with the aid of more detailed research than other stations. They also are able to maintain a much closer watch on the media of the area, and to detect and fill in the gaps or correct the distortion which occur day-by-day in Eastern media. And finally, they have very large audiences who have learned to look at them for the true picture of events; if our objective is to see that the peoples of the USSR and East Europe get the truth, RFE and RL are prime means of doing so.

One Russian who depends on foreign radio for his news of the world suggested the other day that for Moscow intellectuals, the British Broadcasting Corporation's Russian service is by far the most popular. He ranked the West German radio second, the Voice of America third, and Radio Liberty fourth.

This is not a statement based on statistics. Another Russian, Nobel prize winning novelist Solzhenitsyn, stated in an interview with Mr. Kaiser himself and Hedrick Smith of the *New York Times*, April 3, 1972: "If we ever hear anything about events in this country, it's through them."

Solzhenitsyn also commented on one of his favorite Radio Liberty programs in a subsequent letter to a Western scholar: "I have long been listening with spiritual enjoyment to Radio Liberty on Sunday nights, whenever it has been possible, to the sermons of a doctor of philosophy, Father Alexander, and I am struck by how genuinely modern and elevated is his style of preaching. . . ."

Statistics bear out Solzhenitsyn's point of view rather than that of Kaiser's recent associate. In fact, a major behavioral study conducted in the period 1970-1972 directly contradicts Kaiser's report. This major study was based on interviews carried out by an independent public opinion research service of 1,680 Soviet citizens, primarily tourists temporarily in the West (none were emigrants). The Voice of America, not the BBC, had by far the largest number of regular listeners, with about two out of three tuning into the station on a weekly basis. Radio Liberty and BBC listeners heard their respective stations at approximately the same rate with slightly more than four in ten tuning in weekly and a similar proportion listening at least once a month. Deutsche Welle had the lowest rate of frequent listeners and the highest proportion of listeners who tuned in only seldom.

The study also pinpointed important factors correlating with a high rate of frequent listening to a station. In general, most respondents who liked Radio Liberty had at least a secondary education and were not members of the Communist party. They also listened to Western radio broadcasts more for information than entertainment, and overwhelmingly preferred Radio Liberty's news-cast, political analysis, and information on the USSR. They listened more frequently and enjoyed better reception than the station's critics.

Although there is a good deal of overlap toward Radio Liberty and the Voice of America among the audiences, evidence indicates that the respondents listened

to the two stations for basically different types of programming—they turned to Radio Liberty for news, political analysis, and information on the USSR, and to the Voice of America primarily for “news and music,” with significantly less preference for that station’s other political and informational programming. Indeed, respondents who indicated special motivation for listening to political analysis and information on the USSR emanating from a Western broadcaster turned to Radio Liberty at rates considerably higher than to any other station in the survey. (These responses basically parallel the differences in objectives and planned balance of programming between Radio Liberty and Voice of America.)

Q. What about Mr. Kaiser's comment that: "No doubt, RFE (which broadcasts only to the satellites, leaving the U.S.S.R. to Radio Liberty) has a big audience in the region. But intellectuals seem to like the BBC better. In Hungary, Austrian stations have enormous audience. In Poland, German stations attract thousands of listeners. The VOA is popular everywhere."?

A. While Mr. Kaiser used general terms, available evidence is that RFE’s audiences are not merely “big”; they are by far the largest of any Western station reaching East Europe. RFE’s audience research studies—which are conducted with the aid of responsible West European opinion-research institutes—indicate listening audiences of more than 30 million persons, or one half the population over 14 in the countries which RFE addresses. Radio Vienna, whose audiences Mr. Kaiser called “enormous”, ran second in neighboring Czechoslovakia but fourth in Hungary and fifth in Bulgaria, according to the latest RFE studies.

As for attracting intellectuals, BBC has had the reputation of being their favorite station since World War II, but we know of no specific evidence on this point. RFE studies do indicate that it is highly attractive to the university-educated. For example, while its overall listenership in Czechoslovakia last year was 35% of the population over 14, it was listened to by 49% of the university-educated population. In Hungary, it attracted 53% of the total audience over 14, but 56% of the university-educated.

While such studies are sometimes dismissed as self-serving, RFE’s audience-research methods have been investigated in depth by Oliver Quayle Associates and by the 1972 study of the Congressional Research Service, and declared sound.

The 13 others were all straightforward news stories which were broadcast behind the Iron Curtain by numerous Western stations, from the BBC to Israeli radio.

It is difficult to believe that Kaiser would assume that all Western broadcasters would have the unique focus, quality of analysis, and quantity of detail that were in Radio Liberty’s and Radio Free Europe’s broadcasts on most of these topics. Expert analysis of the Soviet economic situation in connection with military aid to Egypt and with agricultural problems and broadcasts directed to Soviet Moslem populations in six of their languages could only have come over Radio Liberty. The specialization of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe were also essential to broadcasts of comparative attitudes of foreign communist parties in-depth reporting on the Czech crisis in August 1968, and the Polish crisis in December 1970, on Soviet Jewry and human rights protest petitions, as well as readings from the texts of unpublished Soviet writings. While Radio Liberty devotes 60% to 75% of its Russian broadcast time to internal Soviet topics, Voice of America’s Russian service devotes in contrast approximately the same percentage of time to U.S. topics.

Q. Mr. Kaiser makes the flat statements "RFE did help incite Hungarians to revolt in 1956, with consequences too well known." Will you comment on that, please?

A. The West German government made its own investigation of such charges, just after the revolution was suppressed, by monitoring the tapes of all RFE output to Hungary during the period. On the basis of this study, Chancellor Adenauer personally made a public statement dismissing the charge. An investigation by the Council of Europe reached the same conclusion.

Radio Liberty has also broadcast provocative programs, often prepared by Russian émigrés, which the regime here interpreted as direct challenges to its authority.

Provocative programs are certainly a matter of definition. Mr. Kaiser does not mention any programs specifically so this question is difficult to answer. It should be pointed out, however, that any broadcasts that cut through Soviet censorship would be a challenge to Soviet government authority. Also Radio Liberty is justly

proud of its emigre programmers. Radio Liberty represents a close cooperation between American administration and emigre programmers who have an intimate knowledge of the country to which they broadcast. Because of this, Radio Liberty has frequently been complimented for its sound as a true "home" voice and called "our station" by Soviet listeners.

Many Soviet intellectuals, including some active in the dissident movement in recent years, accept the official definition of Radio Liberty as an "enemy" organization. Some prominent dissidents are upset when their petitions or articles are read on Liberty broadcasts. They fear reprisals.

Once again it depends on whom you speak to. Ninety-eight Soviet Jewish emigrants to Israel, in a letter addressed to the U.S. Senate in March 1972 stated:

"Most of us, the undersigned, just arrived from Russia. We still remember very well those evening hours during which we tried to get and listen to the voice of the free world. Sometimes it was very difficult to catch the voice—the Soviets are doing everything to silence the transmission . . . [Without Radio Liberty] the cold war will increase, because nobody inside Russia will be able to say a word about the real affairs of their government and in a certain measure to influence the little public opinion in their country."

The Study Commission report also quoted another emigrant who had heard the broadcast of a petition he had signed: "They (the Soviet police) can arrest us now, but our testimony will stand in history."

Radio Liberty is especially careful about its broadcasts of dissident writings. Its policy requires careful evaluation of a document for authenticity and consideration of the author's intentions and personal situation before a decision on whether to broadcast the item is made.

The two stations are tainted by their names, and to some extent by their emigre personnel.

See earlier answer on emigre personnel. For many listeners Radio Liberty's name is no taint. Attacks in the Soviet press make it even more popular.

Indeed a fundamental reorganization of the stations, giving them new names, new personnel and new outlooks, could increase their audiences. Their old reputations obviously detract from their appeal now.

It would be difficult to answer this point without more specific details. Suffice it to say the Presidential Study Commission did a thorough study and came up with specific recommendations. If a Board for International Radio Broadcasting is created in accordance with those recommendations, it will be up to that board to make whatever changes it feels are necessary.

As to personnel, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe are known for having some of the top experts in Soviet and East European affairs on their staffs as well as pioneers in international broadcasting.

The material they produce could be shared with all the Western stations broadcasting to Communist countries.

Research material from both stations is regularly distributed to other broadcasters, as well as government, academic and journalist specialists in the field.

Mr. Gross. Mr. Chairman, I know the Senate had 2 days of hearings on this subject. Is it supposed to have these witnesses back tomorrow?

Chairman MORGAN. We have some other witnesses scheduled on this very issue tomorrow.

Mr. Gross. I beg your pardon.

Chairman MORGAN. We have some other witnesses scheduled for tomorrow if you look at the schedule in front of you, but the Chair has no objection if we can get the witnesses. We are not going to mark this bill up until we come back anyway and if you want to make a request I am sure—

Mr. Gross. I would like to hear from all the lobbyists on behalf of this bill.

Chairman MORGAN. I am sure there will be no objection to continue the hearings after we come back, Mr. Gross.

Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I don't have any questions. I just want to thank the Chairman of the Presidential Study Commission, Dr. Eisenhower, and all of his colleagues for their willingness to give the time necessary to bring this report to us.

One of the things I take great pride in about America is that we still have many wonderful and knowledgeable people who are willing to give their time and their effort in matters of this kind—services which are so essential to our Nation's well-being.

I have always been a supporter of these programs, but I am concerned about the cost. As all of you know we are trying to establish an expenditure ceiling beyond which the Congress hopes it won't go in an effort to come nearer balancing our budget by reducing deficit spending, improving our balance-of-payments position and so forth.

Is the \$50 million proposed half of the total expenditures? I understand you are suggesting that 50 percent be raised through the Government and 50 percent through private resources, or did I misunderstand that?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I think the Secretary should make a specific statement about the appropriation. The \$50 million is the full cost. It is in the future that we hope to get help from Europe on the \$3½ million research cost as well as private help in rebuilding their equipment, but the \$50 million is the total annual cost of station operations.

There is a statement we would like to make and I think the Secretary—since the appropriation this past year has been to the State Department—is the appropriate person to answer about cost.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Will you do that for us, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. STOESEL. Mr. Congressman, with regard to the appropriation which has been requested—and as Dr. Eisenhower says, this is the full cost—I would like to underline one aspect of this money problem, the devaluation.

I think that the essence of the problem is that the \$50.3 million, which was the February 1973 total, now buys about 10 percent less than it did in April when we had hearings before the Appropriations Committee. The deutsche mark costs about 13 to 14 percent more now than it did after the February devaluation. Eighty percent of the radios' costs are in Europe, mostly in deutsche mark, so this means that even this \$50.3 million figure has been cut about 10 percent in its buying power. I think that underlines this problem of devaluation which we are faced with.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. So you are saying that this does not actually amount to an increase, but that the amount of money you are requesting, because of devaluation of the dollar, will be about what you have been getting?

Mr. STOESEL. Yes. Actually the appropriation is not intended to cover any expansion in personnel or in radio operations. It is intended to cover costs of current personnel expenditures, costs associated with maintaining current operations. It is not an increase, but it is intended to take into account the devaluation problem, and I wish to underline that in the recent months that problem has grown in size.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Can you tell us how much you have been raising, say in the last 2 or 3 years annually, from private sources—foundations and so forth?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Mr. Durkee, who is president of RFE, which is the only one up to now that has been raising private funds and has

been doing so for many years, could give the most precise answer. I said in my testimony that over the years it was about 18 percent of the cost of RFE.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM P. DURKEE, PRESIDENT, RADIO FREE EUROPE

Mr. DURKEE. Yes. The 22-year period from fiscal year 1951 to fiscal year 1973, contributions amount to \$49 million, which was 17.7 percent of total RFE operating expenditures. In fiscal year 1972 we raised \$1,200,000. In fiscal year 1973 the returns are incomplete, but there was very little fund raising because we were uncertain about the future of the radio.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I understand this information is contained in the fact book.¹

Thank you very much.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Whalen.

Mr. WHALEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, on page 10 of the State Department statement you refer to the retirement plan, and the fact that we have failed to contribute to that in the past. I wonder, could you elaborate as to the nature of this plan, what is involved, what the investment is by the two stations and so forth?

Mr. STOESEL. Mr. Chairman, again if I could call on our experts, the two presidents of the radio corporations, I think they have the detailed information on this which you would like to have.

Mr. Durkee.

Mr. DURKEE. The Radio Free Europe plan is one recommended by Marsh & McLennan, Inc., which was instituted in 1968 and replaced a modest pension plan. Its purpose is very simple, it is to compensate people for years of service. It is somewhat similar to the Federal pension scheme, but not as generous. It has no survivor benefits, for example. We make contributions to this pension plan, and the benefit formula is integrated with the company-paid portion of social security. We in the last 2 years, in fact since 1971, have been unable to pay into that pension plan because of insufficient funds.

The funding formula, which is a formula recommended by Marsh & McLennan, and which was provided for in budget requests submitted to both Houses of Congress, provides funds for both past and current service credits well enough in advance so that the employee is assured that when the time comes for his retirement his pension money will be there and he can receive his pension. It is for those purposes we fund. I believe Radio Liberty's plan is somewhat similar.

STATEMENT OF HOWLAND SARGEANT, PRESIDENT, RADIO LIBERTY

Mr. SARGEANT. Yes. We started our pension plan July 1, 1965, based on somewhat similar insurance and retirement experts, including an expert that later became part of the Marsh & McLennan firm that

¹ Fact books on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, which were prepared by the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for committee use, are on file in the committee office.

Mr. Durkee referred to. Ours is a noncontributory plan, employees do not contribute, and it is based on the social welfare benefits that an employee might derive from the plans of U.S. social security, or the social welfare plans of countries in which we also operate.

Mr. WHALEN. Are citizens as well as noncitizens participating in this plan?

Mr. SARGEANT. Yes. One is for U.S. citizens, and one is for overseas employees.

Mr. WHALEN. Thank you.

One final question, Dr. Eisenhower. I know you have alluded to this before, but could you tell us precisely for the record what these two stations do that the Voice of America does not do?

Mr. EISENHOWER. The most obvious difference is that 50 percent of the programing of both stations—RFE and RL—deals with internal reporting. A significant event takes place—

Mr. WHALEN. May I interrupt you.

Mr. EISENHOWER (continuing). Reporting of events within the Communist countries. Also an important event may take place in Poland that would be valuable for the people throughout the area to know. This is reported. Fifty percent of all the programing is of that sort. Am I not correct, Mr. Sargeant?

Mr. SARGEANT. Yes.

Mr. EISENHOWER. The other 50 percent is external. Now there is a difference here in dealing with external news. These two private corporations, as I say, operating essentially as a free press, tell those things which you and I would feel are unfavorable to the free world as well as that which promotes our welfare and makes us look good, the purpose being to rely on the truth, believing that over a period of time the truth is the best and the most effective, persuasive material that can be used. It obviously increases the credibility among the listening audience.

So these are the two vital differences between Voice of America, BBC, Radio France, et cetera, and these two stations.

Mr. ROCHE. The cross reporting is extremely interesting. I mentioned one episode a while ago. For example, there was a ferocious split in the French Communist Party in which they ended up expelling a top cadre, Roger Garaudy, over the invasion of Czechoslovakia. All of this was broadcast, including the ideological discussions and the elaborate kinds of Marxist discussion that went along with it, so that in a way—the term “surrogate free press” has been used.

On my own initiative—being, in my first profession, professor of political theory—I set out to pick a number of crucial issues, and I asked the radio station to do case studies of how they were handled for many, many years. One good example is the Kudirka affair, where a Lithuanian sailor jumped ship. I won't bore you with repetition, but there are many good examples in the report.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I would just like to emphasize again the distinction that does exist between these radios, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty on one hand, and the BBC and the other broadcasters. I was reading Mr. Kaiser's article for the first time, and he said that those who defend the radios trade on the fact that they are the only ones

that tell the truth. That is nonsense. I don't know anybody that is defending these radios on that ground.

I listened to BBC for many years, and I know they tell the truth, but the fact is that it is not a question of whether they tell the truth about world events. They do not—and this is the critical distinction—they do not concern themselves in detail with news and analysis of events within that country.

Back in 1968 I was in Poland, and we had student uprisings in Warsaw. There was not one mention of this even in the Warsaw papers, on Warsaw TV, or the Warsaw radio. Radio Free Europe came in with broadcasts about these uprisings, and 3 or 4 days later the Warsaw press started to report them. They never would have reported them had it not been for Radio Free Europe.

The Polish students took over the Polytechnic for a week and they had 13 demands. The fifth demand was information about what is going on, among students around the country. Point 5 of those 13 points stated that the students would not have to listen to Radio Free Europe if the Polish press would report such information. It is this kind of dissemination of information within the country that is unique about these radios, and it is this kind of dissemination of information that gives the people of those countries an input on policy in those countries.

It seems to me, I need to repeat again, that that input is critical to the development of détente between East and West.

Mr. EISENHOWER. May I just add they are even reporting the unhappy highlights of the Watergate hearings.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. At this point in time.

Mr. EISENHOWER. At this point in time. If they didn't, they would hurt their credibility very much. This also brings out, I think, a distinction between an official voice and a free press supportive of the government.

Mr. WHALEN. Thank you.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Kazen.

Mr. KAZEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have been looking at the very interesting figures on your listener audience, and also the statement that was made about China not having the sets. How many sets are there in Russia?

Mr. EISENHOWER. In the Soviet Union, between 30 and 35 million equipped with shortwave bands. If I am wrong, Mr. Sargeant will correct me.

Mr. SARGEANT. That is correct, one for every two households.

Mr. KAZEN. Is that the same average in all of these countries?

Mr. DURKEE. One for about every five persons over 14, in Radio Free Europe's listening area.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. There are not many households in Poland that do not have a shortwave radio.

Mr. EISENHOWER. High frequency sets are rather rare in this country, they are rather standard there.

Mr. ROCHE. Shortwave is really the way of getting information.

Mr. KAZEN. Well, I have always been a supporter of these stations,

and I am convinced that you are doing a fine job, and the purpose for which it was created is coming through.

On another point, Mr. Ambassador, that you made a while ago on credibility, the last time that we had hearings on this subject we had a man that had just come out of Poland, and I asked him the question, "Do they know that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are being supported by the Federal Government, or by the U.S. Government?"

And he said, "Oh, yes."

"Well, has this detracted from its credibility?"

He said, "No, it has not."

In fact people are eager to listen.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I think one has to realize that unique institutions are built over years. You could not recreate them if you tried it. I don't think you could recreate Radio Free Europe if you abolished it and tried to start it over. It has grown over 20, 30 years, and it has developed a character of its own.

It has always been supported by the Federal Government, sometimes more covertly than others, but somehow it has developed an independence within that frame and a credibility with its listeners. One of the reasons that I argued so strongly in the Commission and elsewhere against European governments contributing to the support of the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is my belief that this would destroy that independence. Not only would you have a bland product, but you would destroy that character that is unique to those radios.

The point I would like to repeat is that when you have an institution that is operating in the manner in which this institution is operating, it would be impossible, if we decided not to fund it and then decided we had made a mistake, to recreate it.

Mr. KAZEN. In other words, you cannot quit and start all over again?

Mr. GRONOUSKI. There is no way, in my judgment.

Mr. KAZEN. Well, I hope we won't have to quit.

Thank you.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Stoessel, Dr. Eisenhower, I want to join my colleagues in thanking you for your in-depth presentation of the Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I think most of us recognize the good work that is being done by these organizations.

I just have a few questions about some of the fiscal concepts. I was interested in your discussion about the comparison with the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. Is there some reason in consolidating all of these in the bill establishing a board for international broadcasting that you cast aside the possibility of including the Voice of America in the composition of this new board?

Mr. EISENHOWER. We conferred at length with the few Federal agencies that could conceivably have been the host for the management of this—the State Department, the USIA—and not only they but we came to the conclusion it would be better to have this as an independent, unique institution.

I concede that if I were the Secretary of State—and the governments of the receiving nations objected to our operating RFE and RL—I would be slightly unhappy. The Soviet bloc governments don't like these radios. The people are the ones who like them. If I were negotiating on arms reduction, better trade relations, and so on, I would not want to be annoyed by having this issue constantly being put before me. Trading away the stations would be calamitous because I am convinced that getting the truth to these people is the main reason we now find ourselves working with some success toward détente.

Now USIA is a slightly different thing. It not only operates the Voice of America, but it has libraries abroad, some of them in these countries, and they might be endangering all of that if they were directly involved. So we came to the conclusion that since RFE and RL are unique, we ought to create this very small, inexpensive board as the means of keeping this surrogate free press going.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I think I should like to add one observation. I think it is critically important to keep the private nature of these two radios. I think if you lumped the three together, one a clearly government radio and the other two radios, which have a very private character in terms of their development in history, you would destroy this private character.

Mr. GILMAN. Wouldn't certain economies be effected by having the three under one organization.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. Not as many as you think. Then you have a boss with these three assistants.

Mr. EISENHOWER. There is one possible economy, sir, and that is in the use of existing broadcast transmitters. One of our recommendations in the report, if this bill passes and the board is created, is that the board should at once make an expert survey of all broadcast facilities available to the U.S. Government and see what could be done in making cooperative use of those facilities. So far as all other efforts toward cooperation short of consolidating the two radios, which we discussed in response to the chairman's question, I think that all other economies are being achieved.

Mr. GILMAN. Dr. Eisenhower, I didn't see, in looking through any of the papers submitted to us, a budget for the overall operation. We see a figure of \$50 million in the bill. Has there been a budget submitted to the committee concerning the overall operation of RFE and RL?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Yes. I think maybe the Secretary should answer this.

Mr. STOESSEL. Yes; that is the figure of \$50.3 that is before the committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Is that the entire budget of both of those radio operations?

Mr. STOESSEL. Yes, that is true.

Mr. GILMAN. Do we have an itemized budget submitted to the committee? Has that been submitted?

Mr. STOESSEL. Yes; we have submitted that, and it is fully itemized.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, if it would be possible to make a sum-

mary of that budget available at this point in the record I would ask your permission to do that.

Chairman MORGAN. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to follows:]

International radio broadcasting activities fiscal year 1974 budget request

| | <i>Thousands</i> |
|--|------------------|
| President's budget: | |
| Radio Free Europe----- | \$28,370 |
| Radio Liberty ----- | 16,270 |
| Total ----- | 44,640 |
| Budget amendment (H. Doc. 93-104) : Increased costs resulting from the devaluation of Feb. 12, 1973 : | |
| Radio Free Europe----- | 3,234 |
| Radio Liberty ----- | 2,060 |
| Total ----- | 5,294 |
| Total fiscal year 1974 budget request : | |
| Radio Free Europe----- | 31,604 |
| Radio Liberty ----- | 18,330 |
| Total ----- | 49,934 |
| Proposed budget amendment for the costs of the Board for Interna- tional Broadcasting ----- | 275 |
| Estimated total fiscal year 1974 budget requirements----- | 50,209 |

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Eisenhower. I noted in the record that the committee reported on page 53 of the Commission report that you noted that there were liquidation costs for RFE and RL estimated to be some \$80 million because of some legal obligations under the laws of the countries in which those stations operate. Is it possible that the European countries participating in the financing of these radios could assume a portion of those obligations?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I would hope so, sir. We have to get to the point where they are participating. That figure is a carefully calculated one by RFE and RL. It is a cost largely made obligatory by the laws in the countries in which the stations operate. It has to do with retirements, closing down operations, separation pay, and so on. The corporation would have the legal and moral obligation to live up to our own rules and the laws of host countries.

May I emphasize that should the decision of the Congress be to close these stations, this obligation would fall upon the two private corporations and their boards. But since these stations from the first have been financed by and in harmony with the policies of the U.S. Government, I could not conceive of either the executive or the legislative branches of Government permitting private persons, such as General Clay, who have been willing to serve as the directors of these great and useful corporations, personally to bear such an obligation.

On your specific question, I think we will have to get to the point where they are giving us the help that we hope and believe they can, which will be a minor portion of the total cost. I would hope that they could also assume a portion of that liquidation cost.

Mr. GILMAN. Dr. Eisenhower, with regard to your asking help from other nations, I am a bit confused from reading the Commission report in that on page 50 you stated that:

In its decision to recommend against seeking direct operating support for the radios from the governments of Western Europe, the Commission was acutely aware of the persuasive arguments advanced by some Members of Congress calling upon the nations of Western Europe to share in the cost of programs which also serve their beliefs and from which they also benefit.

Then you go on to state, on page 51, that:

The conclusion of the Commission that it would be a mistake to involve European governments in contributing to the financing of the broadcast operations of the two radios does not constitute the rejection of the principle of cost-sharing.

Could you explain that a bit for our committee?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Yes. The word to emphasize there, Mr. Congressman, is the word "operation." As we have said, we think it would possibly destroy the radios if there were multinational control of the daily, rapid fire business of preparing and voicing the broadcasts—different policies from France, different policies from Belgium, and the other participating countries. We are very much in favor of their supporting, not operating costs, but research and technical equipment costs. So that is what the statement is saying there.

Chairman MORGAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Wolff.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentleman, as someone who spent a good part of my life in communications prior to entering Congress, I have more than a passing interest in these operations.

I am interested in learning the role of the Office of Telecommunications in the operation of these stations.

Mr. STROESSER. I am not aware that it has any role.

Mr. WOLFF. In other words, the Office of Telecommunications has a greater role in the control and conduct of domestic stations than it would have in these stations subsidized by the U.S. Government, is that correct?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I might say that I think it was the telecommunications policy group—perhaps that was in the State Department—that helped negotiate the agreement with other nations that jamming would not be permissible to which the Soviet Union was a party. But, of course, it is being violated. That is not a group that has anything to do directly with the operation of these two stations.

Mr. WOLFF. How about in setting policy?

Mr. EISENHOWER. No.

Mr. WOLFF. Then where is the policy set?

Mr. EISENHOWER. It is up to the State Department to see to it, but with the board established, cooperating with the State Department, it would be the responsibility of the board to see that these two stations operate in harmony with American foreign policy.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Secretary, the State Department does not have any input then from the Office of Telecommunications?

Mr. STROESSER. Not with regard to policy considerations.

Mr. WOLFF. I support the general mandate of these stations. I support the idea basically, but I am concerned about statements that have

been made by three of the gentlemen here during testimony I have heard talk about a "surrogate free press". I believe it was Mr. Eisenhower who said they operate "as much as they can as a free press." Someone, I believe it was Mr. Gronouski, said "somehow these stations developed an independence."

What I am concerned about is the control that is exerted; I believe it is important for us to understand the "freedom (?) " enjoyed. I believe that the answer alternative to totalitarianism is free thought and free expression. Now, I wonder how we get this free expression with the various limitations that seem to have been placed by a number of people here on the panel.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. Let me just make the observation that if we could figure out a way to do it, I would prefer that the radios not have any control by the State Department or anyone else, because I think they have developed a very responsible policy sense.

Mr. WOLFF. I agree with you.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. But we run into the problem that when Congress appropriates money, Congress wants to know what is going to happen to that money, and wants to make accountable the administrative agency to which it appropriates funds. To me the development of this board as a special agency standing between the Congress and the radios is a most defensible way to accomplish both of these conflicting ends—to have a Government agency distributing the money and, therefore, responsible to Congress, and yet to maintain the maximum independence on the part of the radios.

Mr. WOLFF. Has there been any change in the policy of the stations that has occurred from the time it was a covert operation to today where it is overt?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Oh, indeed. When the stations first started, I think it is fair to say——

Mr. WOLFF. No, I don't mean when they started, I am talking about the year 1970, when the cover was lifted.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Well, the guidance came from a different place. The guidance originally was from the CIA.

Mr. WOLFF. The CIA has no longer any input at all?

Mr. EISENHOWER. None whatsoever. It has absolutely no connection of any kind.

Now the personnel of the radios in New York are in touch with the State Department as often as they need be to get foreign policy information on any new and important activity that may develop. For example—I pull this out of the air—if Tito should pass away, this would create a new situation requiring consultation. Most certainly the radios would not want to be saying anything or making any interpretations that would be contrary to the foreign policy of the United States with respect to that incident. The State Department may review the programs of these stations whenever it wishes to ascertain what has been broadcast.

Mr. WOLFF. Dr. Eisenhower, this question of time is a very important one with us up here. When we get 5 minutes, it is kind of difficult to really ask all the questions that you have in mind.

What I am concerned about is the really "free" aspects of the activities. I am concerned with the State Department dictating policy. In other words, what is the position of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty today on the question of the Cambodian bombing? Here is a

very sensitive issue. When we get into the sensitive issues, who has the final say? Is it the State Department, or is it really a truthful explanation of what is going on?

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Congressman, may I take a stab at that. I don't think that we put more time into anything else than trying to put a handle on this particular billiard ball, because what we wanted to do was to maintain the necessary and constitutional obligations, as John Gronouski said, of asking for the money which is appropriated, and at the same time to permit the maximum amount of freedom within the stations as they are operating.

I took it upon myself in Munich to go intensively to the staff, meet with them, talk to them, and try to investigate the control procedure, so to speak, along the line you are suggesting. I think that what we have come up with is—it is not an ideal solution because I don't think there is an ideal solution; but I think that it does present a technique whereby these two objectives can be measured. Of course, in the end the ultimate protection is the men on the board.

Mr. WOLFF. May I say, I appreciate that. The element I am concerned about is really the loss of freedom of the press in this country at the present time. That is why I alluded to the Office of Telecommunications.

Mr. EISENHOWER. May I just say that, of course, reports of criticism on Cambodia are carried. If they weren't, that is the very sort of thing their press, radio, and television would attack. The stations would lose their credibility for not having done so.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the time is getting short. I am so optimistic that I would hope for a unanimous favorable report from this committee to the House. Therefore, if there are questions which our Commission can answer—if the Executive Director of our Commission would send us the questions, we will prepare the answers and submit them to you.

Chairman MORGAN. Dr. Eisenhower, with your permission we intend to continue after the quorum call so we can run a little longer. Mr. Zablocki is in the House Chamber now. He will answer the quorum call and come back. We will return as soon as we can. Mr. Steele.

Mr. STEELE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, I want to add my congratulations to the outstanding job the Commission has done and its proposal and plan for keeping open these critically important communication channels.

I will limit my time to just one question which has concerned me for some time, and I hope we can get some candid answers on it.

Looking over the languages that Radio Liberty broadcasts in, I am particularly interested in how certain languages have been selected and how others have been excluded.

There are four languages in particular whose exclusion I am interested in. You address it in your fact sheet, but I think you will acknowledge very inadequately. One is Yiddish, the others Latvian, Estonian, and Lithuanian. Surely in all of these cases these groups deserve at least as much attention as, say, the North Caucasian language groups, the Tatar-Bashkir, or the Turkestani group.

I just wonder how these priorities were set in the first place. In an area like the Baltic states, where there is so much foment as there is at the present time, why aren't there channels of communication being

used to accomplish the objective that you have so articulately put forth?

Mr. EISENHOWER. As you know, in the Soviet Union there are some 170 languages and distinct dialects, as I recall, and 11 time zones to cover. Radio Liberty broadcasts in Russian and 17 other languages. In a discussion with former Assistant Secretary Howland Sargeant, who is now President of the Radio Liberty Committee—Radio Liberty very much wants to broadcast to the three Baltic states, which have been taken into the Soviet empire. It is a question of money at this stage.

Am I stating it correctly, Howland, that you would like to broadcast in Lithuanian and so on?

Mr. SARGEANT. Yes. We have made such a proposal, and the State Department on examining our budget approved the proposal, but under budget stringencies this was eliminated before the present transmittal of the budget to the Congress. Radio Liberty is still interested in carrying the Baltic languages if we can get enough money to do so.

Mr. STEELE. It seems to me there are two considerations here: one is the number of people you can reach, and two is the political context in which they live. Now as far as reaching some of these North Caucasian groups, or the Turkestani group, none of you would even attempt to tell me that you think you are really going to have more of an impact on some of these groups even if they listen than you are on the Baltic states, or let's say by broadcasting in Yiddish.

Moreover, it is not simply a question of money, it is a question of priorities that you yourself have set. Now you cannot turn around and simply blame it on Congress for not providing enough money, or blame it on previous administrators. The fact is there has been a conscious selection of priorities, and I would like to know who we have to get to to get these languages included.

Mr. ROCHE. May I speak on the Yiddish point. One of the things that happens to most Russian Jews in Israel is they have to learn Hebrew.

And, Yiddish has been systematically suppressed in the Soviet Union over the years; it is largely a very, very elderly group that speaks it. There has been a positive policy of Russification of the Jewish minority so that very few Russian Jews are fluent in Yiddish.

Mr. STEELE. Your fact sheets says there are a million.

Mr. ROCHE. Yes, but the—

Mr. STEELE. There are well over 2.8 million in the Soviet Union, and according to the fact sheet, which is all the information I have, there are a million who could be reached.

Mr. ROCHE. They can, but, the problem of Yiddish is it is old folks, the people who are the older generation by and large, who are Yiddish speaking. The knowledge of many is marginal, also.

Now on the other language problems, I won't pretend to sort out the priorities. As it now stands, Russians are virtually on the edge, I believe we pointed out, of becoming a minority in Russia. That is to say that I think the Turkic minority is now up there, to approximately a third, or in that order. These Turkic groups are increasingly significant in the politics of the Soviet Union.

I personally would like to agree with you completely, and I would like to see the program being expanded. It is hard to find people to do the broadcasting.

Mr. STEELE. In Lithuanian?

Mr. ROCHE. I concede that point at the outset without argument. But in some of these languages just somebody you bring in and then in a sense train to do the work. When I was in Munich I met somebody who had just gotten out of one of the Central Asian republics, who had just gone to work for Radio Liberty. He was the first member of this particular minority group who may have been able to emerge intact. It is not as easy a job as you might imagine.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Mr. Congressman, may I say that actually the Commission did not study the very important question you are asking, and I would like with your permission to ask Mr. Sargeant to say what would be involved if they discontinued some one or two of the present languages in order to reach the three Baltic areas that you mentioned, or any other group.

Mr. STEELE. I know my time is just about up, but I would like to get a direct answer as to who it is in the U.S. Government who is responsible for making the decision that these languages are not broadcast in? I cannot believe that if it were the choice of this committee or the entire Congress, those funds would not be there. I mean we are deliberately excluding these languages, and I don't believe most of the Congress realize it or would permit it.

Mr. GULLION. I am very sympathetic to the point raised by Congressman Steele. I was struck by the omission of these languages, and I did in the Commission raise this question about the Baltic countries, and also with the personnel in the stations in Munich, and learned that they would indeed like to see broadcasts in these languages. I think these nationalities have a sort of senior claim among other nationalities, having been gobbled up first by the Russians and then by the Germans and then back again.

There does arise a question of assessing priorities, and I don't know by what mechanism that is going to be done. Perhaps someone does need some State Department guidance. If in these budget limitations one has to add the Baltic countries, does someone else have to be erased?

It was my understanding that a project for Baltic nationalities was not turned down in Congress, it was in the Bureau of the Budget that the desire to add——

Mr. STEELE. Where else? I should have known.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Bingham.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Can we submit a statement on this? I think it may be more involved.

Mr. STEELE. I think that might get the ball rolling, and I would be most grateful for that.

Chairman MORGAN. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to follows:]

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY HON. MILTON S. EISENHOWER ON JEWISH AND BALTIC LANGUAGE PROGRAMING

JEWISH PROGRAMING

The Radio Liberty Committee has given considerable attention over the years to the problems of Soviet Jews in its regular programs in Russian, Ukrainian and other languages. Recently Jewish consciousness has increased and events have demonstrated a need for more RL broadcasts tailored especially for Jews

in the Soviet Union. While numerically constituting only a relatively small segment of the population of the USSR, and widely dispersed throughout the country, Soviet Jews have played a dramatic leadership role in the struggle for increased human rights in that country.

In 1972 Radio Liberty proposed the U.S. Government grant for FY 1974 include \$30,000 for special programming for this Jewish audience. However, the funds proposed for this project and other "new project" funds requested by RL were eliminated from the FY 74 budget as submitted by the Administration to the Congress in January 1973. This resulted from budgetary stringencies as well as the undetermined future of RL pending the outcome of the report of the Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting and Presidential and Congressional action thereon. Nevertheless, even without special funding, RL has made a start toward providing programming for Soviet Jews. During the last quarter of FY 73 it aired a 15-minute weekly series in Yiddish and Russian called "Jewish Cultural and Social Life" as well as a number of one-time special programs on Jewish themes.

BALTIC LANGUAGE PROGRAMING

In late 1970, leaders of the major organizations in the United States representing Americans of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian heritage advised the Radio Liberty Committee of their commonly-held view that "surrogate home service" broadcasts in the Baltic languages should be expeditiously inaugurated. Moreover, they were agreeable for the first time to such broadcasts being conducted by RL. In previous years such a consensus among groups favoring Baltic programming had never been achieved, evidently because of strong sentiment that such broadcasting by RL could imply *de facto* recognition of Soviet power in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

In earlier years groups in the United States interested in the Baltic States had raised the question of whether Radio Free Europe might broadcast to the Baltic peoples. RFE was established as a corporation in 1949 for the purpose of broadcasting to the peoples of six countries of Eastern Europe brought under Soviet domination following World War II. They were Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and, very briefly, Albania. With respect to the inquiries of these interested groups, the Department of State took the position that RFE should confine its broadcasting to the areas of East Europe to which it had initially undertaken to broadcast.

Following the agreement reached between Radio Liberty and the groups in the United States interested in Baltic language broadcasts, mentioned above, RL proposed initiation of such services in its budget proposal for a federal grant for FY 74. It was estimated that six persons would be needed for each of the three language desks plus an American advisor and secretary. It was also estimated that once funds became available, the desks could be organized in time to begin operations in the second half of the fiscal year. Total estimates for personnel costs, free-lance fees and additional rental and related administrative expenditures for one year came to \$540,000. Therefore, \$270,000 for the first half year of operations were requested in the initial FY 74 budget proposal. For the reasons cited above with respect to elimination of RL "new project" funds for Jewish programming, funds for Baltic language broadcasts also were eliminated from the FY 74 budget.

Could RL broadcasting operations be overhauled in order to include Baltic language programming without increased funds? The proposed FY 74 grant for Radio Liberty operations was amended from \$16,270,000 in the President's budget to \$18,330,000, as reflected in H.R. 8144, to offset the effect of the February 1973 devaluation of the dollar against currencies in Europe, where 80% of RL operations are conducted. However, further devaluation in the past four months has left RL nearly \$2,000,000 short of funds to carry on its operations at the planned FY 74 level, assuming authorization and appropriation of the full amount requested by the Administration.

The budgetary picture described above, thus, strongly militates against consideration of overhauling RL operations this year to make way for future broadcasts in the Baltic languages. Even if RL were to eliminate some of the 18 languages presently broadcast, this would not produce immediate savings. Termination of employees in any one fiscal year does not result in savings but may even require increased expenditure. Separation allowances required by contract and union agreements to pay staff dismissed without additional Con-

gressional appropriations for that purpose would absorb all potential savings in that year.

I have been assured that the Department of State continues to support Radio Liberty's intention to begin broadcasts to the Baltic peoples in their languages and to expand Jewish programming as soon as practicable. Passage by the Congress this year of authorizing and appropriation legislation with adequate funds to maintain present operations would provide the essential base of security and stability for RL to responsibly propose such operation in its FY 75 budget presentation. Radio Liberty estimates that, according to the current buying power of the dollar, the cost of gearing up for Baltic broadcasts in FY 75 would be \$360,000, with initiation of programming in the third quarter. The budget required for a full year of broadcasting would be \$720,000.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to apologize to the members of the Commission for being late. I had to attend another committee meeting markup.

I am very impressed with the presentation, particularly the fact that all of the members of the Commission are here. I would like to support the statements made by the gentleman from Connecticut, and particularly with respect to Yiddish.

First of all, Mr. Roche, my experience in meeting and talking with many of the refugees coming from the Soviet Union to Israel is that they do speak Yiddish, and this includes many young people who have been brought up in that tradition. There is another factor there too, and that is that broadcasting in Yiddish would have a kind of symbolic importance that I think should not be overlooked. Some of us have pressed very hard on the VOA to have some portion of its time beamed to the Soviet Union in Yiddish. I think it is a recognition of a culture and a recognition of an identity to the Jewish people that is very important. This goes beyond the communication factor, because most of the Jewish people there do speak Russian, unless they are from Georgia, or somewhere like that. But if there is a small amount of time devoted to Yiddish I think it would have great significance.

I notice a brief reference in the report to the matter of changing the names of the stations. I think that perhaps this should be given somewhat more consideration than apparently was allotted there. I realize there may be difficulties. I realize there is a tradition here, but on the other hand the point has been made that these stations are operating in a different way than they did in the past, that there is less of the cold war involved.

The names are perhaps offensive to those that don't agree with the stations, and somewhat more neutral names might be adopted that would get away from the connotation of the past cold war policies.

I don't know whether any members of the Commission would like to comment.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I would like to comment on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Could I make one comment first.

I am just informed that Radio Liberty is devoting a small amount of time to special Yiddish broadcasts. This is new.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am delighted to hear it.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Secondly, may I say that our committee discussed at great length the possibility of changing the names. The last thing that Senator Fulbright said to me when I spent an hour to an hour and a half with him was, "Well, if you continue these radios, change

their name to do away with the cold war connotation that carries forward."

We did recognize that the initials have great value just as CBS and NBC have in our country. We searched a long time for names that could keep the initials and still have meaning, and we didn't come up with anything useful. We didn't want to sacrifice the symbolic value, or the newsworthy value either that has been built up. If we could find a new name, if the new board when it is set up can find a new name, I would have no objection.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to suggest that, at least from my point of view, it would be unwise to change the names. Now it might be wise to change them in order to get better acceptability in the United States among their critics, but you won't get any better acceptability on the part of the governments of Eastern Europe and Russia with a change in name, and in my judgment, you will get less acceptability on the part of the people of those countries with a change of name.

Mr. BARRETT. My old friend, Congressman Bingham, sounds exactly like what I raised in one meeting, I think almost as eloquently as you did. It bothered me. Finally, after long, long discussion I reached the conclusion, I think rather reluctantly, that the trademark value, the recognition of work that had been done and so forth probably argued in favor of retaining the names—particularly since they could be interpreted in various ways, including a détente sort of way.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you.

I just have one other question. You mentioned Dr. Eisenhower, that you had had conversations in the Soviet Union that indicated a great degree of acceptance of the stations, and you stressed the importance of that. To the extent that you can in open session, I would be interested to know how you obtained this information.

Mr. EISENHOWER. In a long trip of a month, ranging all the way from central Siberia down to Tashkent in the south, Kiev, Moscow, and Leningrad, I had an opportunity to talk with students in the universities and I learned from them that many of them were regular listeners to Radio Liberty. They were also a sort of central locus for spreading information among others.

The one I cited in my first statement, however, was based upon an interview with a charming young man and woman who had lived in the heart of Moscow and had succeeded in getting out only a year before. Despite the fact that Moscow is jammed, both by large aerial jammers as well as ground jammers, they were able to get the programs right in the heart of Moscow. They said this was the way they learned that their government did not tell them the truth and learned what was going on in the world as well as in their own country.

Mr. GULLION. Mr. Chairman, we have not referred much in the report to the testimony of people who are out of the Soviet Union and are going back or who are out of the zones of Central Europe and do plan to return. I happen to see a number of these people up in Massachusetts in the student area, both students and professors, exchange people. I cannot give their names or identify them too closely. Some of them do have government connections back home.

What is very interesting is their testimony to the importance of these stations in promoting a kind of a check-and-balance system within the

Communist governments; that is, the government listenership, and the civil servants and bureaucrats do listen to these broadcasts and in some way may be able to exercise some influence on their bosses. You cannot obviously make a long record on that because you expose these people because they do intend to return and they have family liabilities at home.

Mr. BINGHAM. But it was possible to have conversation in the Soviet Union with students and others who indicated what they followed.

Mr. EISENHOWER. One thing I was not able to achieve in three visits was to hear them say a word of criticism of their own system of government. That is taboo. It is impossible.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. That is not the case in Poland.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is very interesting that they would not criticize their own government, but tell you they enjoyed the broadcast.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Congressman Bingham, to a charming student at the University of Leningrad I said, "Have you been out of the Soviet Union?" And he said, "Oh, we wish we were permitted to go."

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARRINGTON [presiding]. At the risk of impugning the credibility of the Chair which was vacated, I noted the majority and the minority share the views which have existed to this point. At the risk of having John Roche label me neoisolationist I will put my biases on the table. I was one of seven Members voting against this last year, I intend to vote against it again this year, and I hope to be joined by a substantial number of others in the House, although I have no illusions about that situation developing.

In listening to Dr. Eisenhower talk about broadcasting the truth—and I think that was your choice of words, Doctor—to Eastern Europe and Russia: in listening to Ben Rosenthal, who is far more direct than I am capable of being, asking why we didn't expand the area of activity; in view of events that might be characterized by the Pentagon Papers and certain events that are unfolding on the Senate side; and in light of the recent testimony of Major Knight, Captain Knight, whatever his rank is, on the suppression of information from both the Congress and the rest of the country; I could not help but feel some sort of general irony in the presentation. I don't think this is intentional, but I think it clearly represents the moral rectitude or smugness which to a degree has characterized altogether too often the continuation of this approach.

I fully support, by the way, so that there is no misunderstanding, what the President has tried to do in the course of his 4 years to undo 25 years of foreign policy, efforts that historically, deserve greatness and appreciation. I think that there is a great deal of symbolism attached to the meetings that have occurred between East and West. There is a long time to go between the symbolic exchanges we have seen, and the accommodation between the societies may very well come to pass.

Whether Radio Free Europe is renamed, whether it is broadened to the degree that we don't have CIA influence, whether we generally try to change the makeup, or attitudinally try to incorporate other points, I just for the life of me don't understand how you can feel that even momentarily you can use the bargaining chip argument which was thrown out this morning.

Further, what is the major historical foreign policy argument in favor of continuing it? I might say one of the many ironies that compounds this debate is the amount of money you are looking for is far in excess of our U.N. contribution which has been far more fought over. The U.N., after all, is more likely to bring about more of the kind of accommodation or understanding and appreciation that this is ever likely to produce.

Having, I suppose, trespassed on the goodwill established earlier, and, to a degree having expressed a lack of appreciation of what went on before I got here—I will blame American Airlines for part of it—I will leave it to you people to respond on either a broad or narrow plane to any of these observations.

Mr. ROCHE. My initial observation is that you are one of my favorite neoisolationists. I supported you.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Thank you.

Mr. EISENHOWER. I might point out, sir, that if there are situations in which our own government does not illuminate us with the truth, it is the free press in this country that eventually sees to it that we get it. I think a large part of our presentation is based——

Mr. HARRINGTON. By a very narrow margin, Doctor.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Eventually it comes out.

Mr. HARRINGTON. And in the Soviet Union——

Mr. EISENHOWER. And in the Soviet Union there is no such thing as a free press. RL is it.

Mr. ROCHE. I was under the illusion that the bombing of Cambodia was, in fact, leaked in 1969, and to have it suddenly resurface as a secret in 1973 strikes me as perhaps being just part of a particular cycle.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I don't think Bill Beecher, even before he put on his new hat, indicated that there was a deliberate distortion of the records provided the Congress by the highest military and civilian officials. My point is not to debate Cambodia, but to say that our definition of what the world needs may not fall necessarily on receptive ears at this point, and perhaps a little more humility might characterize our entire approach.

Mr. EISENHOWER. You mentioned the United Nations. I might say that many of its decisions would not be reported within the Soviet Union if it were not here for the Voice of America, BBC as well as——

Mr. HARRINGTON. What about the third way of doing it—the question of having us contribute to some sort of broadly defined—whether it be quasi-U.N. or otherwise—effort of disseminating on a worldwide basis what information may be decided by a cooperative structure?

Mr. EISENHOWER. It probably would turn out to be as ineffective as UNESCO. It would not be worth it. UNESCO, responsible for programs costing about three quarters of a billion dollars a year, has three purposes:

One of the major purposes set forth in the UNESCO Charter is to bring about a free flow of information among all the peoples of the world. This simply has not been done by UNESCO.

Mr. GULLION. I just don't think we have come that far down the road yet, Congressman. I fail to see how there could be any kind of meaningful communication or common statement on any incident or

current controversy coming out of the United Nations as a whole; it would be very difficult to see how this would be other than some kind of lowest common denominator thing compounded to the nth degree. I think it is an idealistic goal, but it is so millennial.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I just can't help but think of the irony of cutting an arms control budget by \$3 or \$4 billion of fighting hard with your leading representative at the United Nations to cut back on our aid by 25 percent, or thereabouts, and then to increase to about what, \$38 to \$50 billion, or 20 percent of the budget for this relic of a policy. At least at the highest levels there has been the foresight in my opinion to begin to leave this approach behind us. This is a sign, I hope, of both maturity and common sense, but that is what makes no sense to me when combined with the policy you advocate today. Look, I am not so sure we will resolve it today.

I appreciate your being here as a lighter or more captive audience than I have a right to expect, but I wanted to make my views reasonably clear to you.

Mr. ROCHE. I am not sure that I would like to see some of the United Nations resolutions going out over the air, like the ones recognizing the existence of a Palestinian State, and calling in effect for destruction of Israel. I don't want to get off onto any side streets with you, but frankly I am a little unsettled by that notion.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I will leave the side streets cautiously alone.

Mr. STOESSER. Mr. Congressman, just a few points, if I may. With regard to this question of truth—what is broadcast and so on—I think it is one thing what we broadcast about this country. As Dr. Eisenhower said, the stations do broadcast what is known here, what is available in the press and through the deliberations of Congress. Of course, as has been stressed here, the part of the programing of these stations concerns what goes on in the countries themselves—in the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union. Much of this is simply factual information which is not otherwise available to the listeners, and we feel very much that this is a useful undertaking.

You place the initiatives of the President certainly rightly, in his seeking détente and accommodation with our adversaries. The President, of course, supports the operation of these stations.

Mr. HARRINGTON. We can get into that ambivalence at some other point. In the message of June 29 on the Cambodian bombing, the theory of a Communist conspiracy at work in a monolithic sense is an interesting question, but that might lead to a whole series of other questions. The mainstream of the policies I think is praiseworthy.

Mr. STOESSER. We were also interested in this question of a free flow of information. In the conference on European security this is one thing we have been pushing for, though the Soviet Union has not been very keen about it. The Soviet representatives at the conference in Helsinki made certain commitments about working toward a freer flow of information. The very things they said and committed themselves to have really not been reported in their own press, or on their own radios. Radio Liberty does that. It informs the people of the Soviet Union in detail about what their own representatives are doing, and I think it helps to build up some pressures on their leaders to fulfill the pledges they have made.

So I think in that sense these radios make a contribution toward détente, and understanding.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Well, in a word that is as much appreciative of symbols as realities. I am not at all convinced that the \$50 million you want to spend could not be better spent in further exchanges on a personal basis or even, to use a suspect area, the commerce which has begun to develop in a substantial way in grains and gas exploration. I happen to think that in the longer run these are areas where I would like to see our money invested.

Mr. EISENHOWER. I don't think you were here when I made my opening statement. May I say you made a comparison of these to other nations. I would like to make the comparison of the cost to rendering these stations to the \$17 billion we are spending for military security in Europe.

Mr. HARRINGTON. We have all sorts of analogies in this afternoon's procurement bill and weapons systems too.

Mr. EISENHOWER. If it is true, as I firmly believe it is, that the present movement toward détente on the part of the Soviet Union is taking place because her people have learned gradually over a period of time that life is different and better in Western Europe and other countries than it is at home, and they want more consumer goods, and they want more of the things of life that they knew could be available, then the cost of informing the people of the Soviet bloc becomes small in relation to future possible savings.

I am convinced that a major incentive in the arms reductions talks, in promoting trade with the United States, as they have previously with Western Europe, is to achieve conditions under which they can reorder their priorities and put greater effort into the production of those goods which will increase the quality of life.

Now if this thesis is correct, as I am profoundly convinced it is, then the cost of \$50 million is miniscule. It is one-third of 1 percent of what we are spending in sheer military terms for security in Europe. If détente could bring about mutual reductions by both the Warsaw powers and the NATO powers, these radios would have paid for themselves a hundredfold.

Mr. HARRINGTON. I have been given a note that Congressman Fascell would like to ask some questions. I appreciate your kindness in letting me dominate this exchange.

Thank you.

Congressman Fascell.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you.

I would like to ask the members of the Study Commission either individually or collectively about the proposal set forth by Paul Bartlett in testimony before the Senate committee. He testified about the possibilities of combining these two radio stations with others and operate as a commercial radio station. The idea being that current operations would be financed by selling advertising in the normal sense to private United States and European corporations doing business over there. Initial capitalization would be by the U.S. Government.

What is your reaction to the feasibility of that politically and economically? What are some of the advantages and disadvantages of that plan?

Mr. EISENHOWER. May I say that point must have come up in the Senate hearings after we had completed our testimony because I had not previously heard it, so I don't think I could make a helpful comment. I would have grave doubt about the possibility of getting commercial advertising that would go to the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union because of their controlled currencies and other difficulties.

If the United States develops trade with the Soviet Union, it is going to be on a negotiated basis, not on the basis of one company advertising and selling roller skates or toiletries or anything else to the Soviet Union. It is quite a different problem.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I have a hunch that the advertisers would be on the Soviets' enemies list.

Mr. EISENHOWER. If there is anyone who can make an intelligent answer I wish he would.

Mr. BARRETT. I was once responsible for Radio Luxembourg broadcasting to the Germans, and one young man came up with a semiserious memorandum saying "When surrendering, please mention Radio Luxembourg."

I am just afraid there is no way to pay for it.

Mr. EISENHOWER. It would be ideal if these two radios were to be wholly privately financed, but this is too much to expect.

Mr. FASCELL. I gather then from the responses that the scope of the study did not encompass anything in terms of international broadcasting except the continued operation of these stations as they exist.

Mr. EISENHOWER. We studied the relation of these stations to other governmental stations, including the Voice of America. We did not consider the possibility of having them become, either by consolidation or any other method, wholly privately funded because we thought it was simply not realistic to expect that you could get enough private money to support them.

Mr. FASCELL. And yet there are, of course, private international broadcasting stations. One of the opposition arguments has been that this is a cold war hangover and that it is really an irritant to sovereignty. Yet despite the political irritant there has been a détente of some sort. The question is whether under the proposed changes there would be any lessening or increase in the obvious political irritant.

Mr. EISENHOWER. The stations are an inducement to détente, and not a deterrent.

Mr. FASCELL. Is that because of a change in the substance of the broadcasts as envisioned?

Mr. EISENHOWER. No; as the content exists now. In other words, our argument is that an informed population does have an influence on official policy, even in dictatorial countries, and it is the wishes of the people as known by the Politburo and the Council of Ministers and others in these countries that are a major inducement. I don't, of course, say it is the only one working toward détente, reduction of armaments, trade, and the like.

Mr. FASCELL. The Soviets have more foreign broadcasting than any other nation in the world. Obviously, they must operate a number of quite similar operations. Do you have any idea how many there are?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. And what their listening audience is in Europe?

Mr. EISENHOWER. There is a chart in the book. Soviet radio, itself, broadcasts, as I recall, 1,900 hours per week in 84 different languages but they also have Radio Independent Spain—which pretends to be an independent radio station but is financed by the Soviet Government—broadcasting exclusively to Spain; Radio Free Portugal; the radio which goes to Turkey; the Voice of Truth, which goes to Greece; and Radio Iran Courier.

Now, in addition to that, of course, their regular broadcast circle has grown. For 8 years I was Special Ambassador to Latin America and wherever I went in all of Latin America I could turn on the shortwave radio any time and get the Soviet broadcasts.

Mr. FASCELL. Does that chart reflect the broadcasts to the United States?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. What does it show?

Mr. EISENHOWER. It is about 250 hours per week to the United States, mainly in English, but also in the languages where there are groups in this country from Eastern Europe that still speak their native languages.

Mr. FASCELL. It seems fair to conclude that the broadcasts by these two radio stations to the Soviet Union are more of an irritant to them than the Russian broadcasts are to Europe. What would your reaction be if there was a suggestion that we would have a mutual curtailment of all these operations?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I have often thought about the desirability of intellectual disarmament in the world as well as physical military disarmament.

Mr. FASCELL. I seem to remember a book by Arthur Larson.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Yes. Unfortunately that would leave us with a situation in which hundreds of millions of people in the world live behind walls of information control and know only what their governments want them to know. The Declaration of Human Rights and the UNESCO Constitution, to which the Soviet Union and most European countries are parties, indicate that it is not an intrusion upon sovereignty to have information flow across national boundaries, so we are not engaged in any illegal activity in term of international agreements.

Mr. FASCELL. You are advocating freedom of communication.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Precisely. The minute we have freedom of communication these radios ought to go out of business.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I make essentially the same point. I think the question of the good sense in having these radios has to resolve itself on the basic proposition that it is important in terms of developing better relationships between the countries of East and West Europe, and it is important that the individual citizens of those countries have access to information about what is going on in their own countries.

The next step, in our thinking, is that if they do have that access they will bring some pressure to bear on their own governments, just as we have seen pressure brought to bear on our government from time to time, and a change in direction of policy resulting from the pressure coming from the grassroots. If that is not important to de-

tente, then the radios are not important. I think it is critically important to détente, but to suggest that these are cold war relics is putting a title on them that completely hides the whole creative concept of these radios and the critical importance of these radios in terms of developing the information base in those countries to at least get some degree of influence on the part of the people on the governments of those countries, just as we have experienced in this country.

Mr. FASCELL. Then it seems that the underlying presumption of your conclusion is that you advocate a competition in open communications which is short of exacerbating propaganda or sovereignty struggles, so as not to make communication a point of negotiation—

Mr. GRONOUSKI. That is right.

Mr. FASCELL (continuing). Or government representation. In other words, there is a line you can tread there—without causing a major confrontation.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. It is a very important line.

Mr. FASCELL. And yet the Russians continue to jam extensively the Voice of America. Have there been any bilateral negotiations with the Russians on the question of communications?

Mr. STOESSER. Mr. Congressman, we have for a number of years, of course, urged this concept of more information exchange. We have objected to the jamming of the official voice of the United States, the Voice of America. In our conversations and negotiations in the context of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe we have pressed, along with our allies and other Western countries, for a freer exchange, and have expressed great concern about the Soviet Union's activities in jamming and attempting to maintain their information monopoly. So we are constantly pressing on this question.

I would say also that, of course, the Soviet Union and the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe don't like these broadcasts because they do interfere with their attempts to maintain a monopoly of the information going to their citizens. However, we have seen no evidence that this dislike of the programs, the irritation that they may cause the governments, has interfered with the process of détente. We do feel, as Mr. Gronouski and others have said, that the radios contribute to pressures for détente. When these Communist governments see that it is in their own interest to move toward détente, toward greater accommodation, they do so.

The radio broadcasts have not interfered with that. We do not think that they are at all an impediment to this process, but they rather contribute to it.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EISENHOWER. If I can add a light note. When my brother was in Washington he said to me one evening, "I would like to send 10,000 American university students to the Soviet Union to develop real understanding and have 10,000 come over here." He said, "Get the Secretary of State on the telephone."

The Secretary of State said, "Mr. President, we are having a terrible time negotiating with the Soviet Union right now on a cultural exchange agreements, and we are up to 10 students and 3 artistic groups to be exchanged each year."

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

These witnesses have been here for 3 hours now and I think they have done an excellent job. It has been a wide ranging discussion, and I don't intend to impose on them much longer. Possibly we have escaped discussing some of the nuts and bolts of what you are recommending.

I would like to ask you about the proposal in your report that the executive staffs of both the stations should be located in the Washington area. I would think if one of the objectives of the board is to preserve the radios' professional independence and integrity that every effort should be made to avoid Washington. What is the point of trying to move this team to the Washington area?

Mr. EISENHOWER. What the report says is that the board and the executive staffs of the two radios should be in contiguous space, and that we think is essential, preferably in the Washington area.

In other words, we are not too concerned about the location. The sole reason for the Washington suggestion is that it makes it much easier for the board to be in touch with the State Department. Let's say the headquarters were out at Rockville, or they might even come over to Baltimore, which is a very nice place. It would be easier for them to keep in touch with the State Department and the General Accounting Office, which is the auditing agency that would audit these the same as other agencies, and to know what official policy is. This is not a point which we insist upon. If, once the new board is established, they prefer to remain in New York they would never hear from us. The important point is that they should be in contiguous space. The new board could then have a miniscule staff, for it would depend upon the executive staffs of the current operating radios to do most of the work.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, if there were validity in that argument, should the operations in Munich be moved back so as to have ready access to the State Department? I would think communication is relatively easy wherever they are physically located. I would think that it might be well to try to avoid a Washington flavor.

This proposal of contiguous space raises a real reservation I have about the core of your proposal, and that is a five-man board. I am not sure what it is supposed to be. You point out that it is supposed to be a sound mechanism, it is supposed to be a simple and inexpensive form of Federal organization. I would doubt that a nonsalaried five-man board will accomplish very much except to provide a formal device to allow money to be allocated to these stations.

It sounds more ambitious than that, but are you really going to get a day-to-day concentration on the responsibilities of those stations from a five-man nonpaid board? I would hope that we could continue to rely on the good judgment of the board of directors of the stations themselves. I would think that a small board would not be absolutely essential, except perhaps to placate an element in Congress. I would guess it has worked pretty well to have the State Department finance the radios. There seems to be considerable stature and substance and independence under the system as it operates now.

Why should this five-man board be subject to confirmation by the Senate? What is the point of that? Is that to placate an element in the Senate that feels sensitive about not having a role to play?

Mr. EISENHOWER. No. First, as you well know, the Congress does not appropriate directly to private institutions, so it simply comes down to the question of what agency should seek the appropriation through the President and the Congress. To whom should the appropriation be made, who should make the allocation to the two private corporations, and who should be responsible for seeing to it that the money is prudently used for the purpose intended.

Then a point that was very prominent in the hearings here 2 years ago and in the Senate, and as we talked to Senators and Congressmen in advance—it was emphasized that we had to devise a system where we could assure the Congress and the President that these stations were operating in a way not inconsistent with American foreign policy, and that phrase was also in the appointment letter which the President sent to each of us.

After having considered all the other methods that might be used, such as the State Department as the transmitting Agency for these funds or the USIA, we finally came to the conclusion that this small board of five, who would be paid only on a per diem basis when they are meeting, with a very small staff—in my judgment perhaps not more than five persons—was the best that we could devise. The cost could be minimal.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You are emphasizing the fact that it is not going to perform any function, except perhaps to jog the stations to take a look at areas where they should be directing their attention and types of broadcasts. The board will be too small to have expertise themselves, and they will be too busy. It looks as if a board would be nothing more than a formal spigot.

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Chairman, may I speak to this. I believe very strongly in trust in Government, but within limits. I would be delighted to loan Mr. Durkee or Mr. Sargeant a hundred bucks without the slightest hesitation. On the other hand, I grew up in the John F. Kennedy school of politics where to have a gun behind the door is a deterrent from the problems which require one to employ it. This is a private view and does not necessarily reflect the views of my colleagues, but it seems to me the existence of this Agency with a highly trained staff, is in a sense a guarantee that I personally would like to see operating on behalf of the Government of the United States.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. My response would be that Congress basically is the gun behind the door. Setting up a part-time operation which is admittedly small, and which will not have its own expert staff, looks like window dressing. One has to rely on the judgment, the discretion, and the maturity of those who run the stations to avoid problems such as might develop.

Your suggestion that the board must have contiguous space with the stations recognizes that it will rely essentially on the stations.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. Might I just make an observation which has some real distinction from that which my colleague, Dr. Roche, made. My own preference, is that it be just a conduit.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would be happier if you describe it that way.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. That would be a conduit, a way to get money from this Congress into the hands of the two radios, because I do have that kind of bias. I think Congress is enough of a gun behind the door, and if we get too many guns behind the door the stations are going to lose some credibility.

Mr. EISENHOWER. I just want to take a position halfway between my two colleagues. The Johns Hopkins University, of which I have been President twice, has a budget of about \$150 million a year, including the Applied Physics Laboratory. Nearly half that money comes from the Federal Government through the NIH, the National Science Foundation, and the like. The agencies make the grants with serious understandings between the university and each Federal agency as to the purpose for which the money is spent and the regulations under which it will be spent. We are also subject to audit by the General Accounting Office.

Now to me this board is simply the National Science Foundation with the exclusive purpose of making grants to private corporations. Johns Hopkins is a private corporation. RFE and RL are corporations to carry out a function of establishing and maintaining a surrogate free press, with only one tiny limitation—they must operate in a way that is not contrary to American foreign policy.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I want to thank all the witnesses again, and express my regrets that both Mr. Durkee and Mr. Sargeant who have been sitting here all morning have not really had their fair share of the discussion. What we are talking about involves them most directly, and they ought to be involved, even tomorrow, in an expression of their views.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I add that second point I forgot a moment ago?

My second point was essentially in reference to why we don't leave this in the State Department, where it is working well. I don't have that much trust that it would continue working well. Here I lack a little trust. I would say that—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You don't have trust in the State Department?

Mr. GRONOUSKI. Not to protect the interests of the radios as a special board would in the event that they get to the budget-cutting squeeze. I doubt that the State Department would want this trust, really.

Mr. ROCHE. I split the spectrum up a little more. I would put my bucks on Durkee and Sargeant and their staffs. We have had real occasion to check up on them and we have looked for skeletons in the closet, and we have found them extraordinarily aware and very, very objective in spite of all the pressures that are brought to bear on them. Nevertheless, the board does have some functions, it is not just a conduit.

Mr. GULLION. Among the most important functions given the board in this report is the task of determining when it should in effect end, among other things. It says:

If restrictions on the free flow of information within one or more of the countries of Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union are erased, the Board should recommend at what point operations of the stations should be either curtailed or halted altogether.

That is a rather important function. I should say it would not be final or determining. I suppose that Congress and the executive branch would both have something further to say, but it does survey systematically the study of conditions in each audit area, and assures the programs schedules are made. If it finds changes to be appropriate, it deals with the major policy issues affecting one or both stations. If you are going to try to move the stations somewhat closer together—I am

not talking about contiguous space now—then logic seems to me to indicate there should be a board to perform this coordinating function.

All of which is not to say the genesis and articulation should not remain in the stations themselves, but I do think that it is consistent with the general American corporate concept or academic concept, or the board of trustees, that you need something of this sort, and you do need it too between the Congress and the stations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Ambassador Gullion, you remind me of Fulbright scoffing when the Commission was proposed. He said it is a foregone conclusion that a commission will advocate a continuation of this activity. I would suppose a board that is given the responsibility of determining when its responsibility should end is not going to do much about seeking an end to its own job. There was of course a likelihood that this Commission was going to come up with the kinds of recommendations that you have made. I think it is a wise decision that you did come up with these decisions.

Chairman MORGAN. Thank you gentlemen.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the courtesy of giving us the opportunity to testify.

I do hope that if you are going to hold additional hearings you will give Mr. Durkee and Mr. Sargeant an opportunity to speak to you directly.

Thank you very much.

Chairman MORGAN. At this point, without objection, I would like to include in the record several communications I have received from distinguished private citizens and individuals interested in the proposed legislation. These documents include:

A letter, dated July 11, 1973, from Mr. George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO.

A letter from Mr. Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America.

A statement submitted by an independent researcher, Dr. Maury Lisann.

[The material referred to follows:]

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., July 11, 1973.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I strongly urge your support for S. 1914 and H.R. 8144, identical bills, which insure the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. These instruments have earned the wholehearted support of this country and all other freedom loving peoples through their highly effective advancement of open communication of information and ideas to the USSR and its captive nations in the heart of Europe.

American labor is counting on the responsible leadership of both Houses taking all steps necessary to assure the passage of a fully-funded program for the effective functioning of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Genuine détente and the cause of just and lasting world peace and freedom cannot be attained unless the peoples of the world enjoy the right to open communication of information and ideas.

The recognition and support of this vital principle must continue to be the unshakeable cornerstone of American foreign policy.

The United States is the principal architect of the Declaration of Human Rights and its most powerful and consistent supporter. Therefore, it is urgent for the U.S. to resist and defeat all pressures and policies which undermine Article 19 of this Declaration which provides for the freedom "to seek, receive

and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

The vital interests of the American nation as a free people call for unstinting practical support of this principle. These bills serve this principle precisely and we urge your wholehearted support.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1973.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On June 20, the nearly 2,000 delegates attending the 35th Annual Convention of the Communications Workers of America in Miami Beach, Florida, passed a Resolution in support of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The Resolution also endorsed enactment of legislation to establish the Board for International Broadcasting, to assist these stations.

Since the Committee on Foreign Affairs will soon be considering the enabling legislation, H.R. 8144, I am enclosing a copy of the Resolution for your Committee's consideration.

The Resolution observes that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were established to provide "a surrogate free press" for the six Eastern European nations, to offer those millions of people facts about the real world.

As workers in the communications industry we believe that until the day when the walls and political barriers that separate East and West are set aside, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty will remain the best "mouth to ear" means of communication between a free and a captive people. The broadcasts carried by these media offer a glimmer of hope to people less fortunate than ourselves.

On behalf of the more than 550,000 people that the Communications Workers of America represents, I appreciate your consideration of our Resolution and urge enactment of S. 1914.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. BEIRNE,
President.

Enclosure.

RESOLUTION 35A-73-7—RADIO FREE EUROPE-RADIO LIBERTY

In the tense years immediately after World War II, the rebuilding of a devastated Europe was underway. The United States organized and led the effort in the western nations. At the same time, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics undertook both a physical and psychological rebuilding effort in eastern Europe.

Thus, in the late 1940's, the "cold war" began. Communist propaganda spread throughout Europe—beyond the "Iron Curtain"—into western Europe, by radio and other means.

To counter the Communist ideological thrusts, Radio Free Europe was founded in 1950, and Radio Liberty in 1953. Radio Free Europe's transmitters were beamed to send programs into Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria. Radio Liberty programs were prepared and transmitted in 19 languages in use in the USSR.

Each of these radio services was established as a "surrogate free press" for the six eastern European nations, to offer those millions of people facts about the real world. From their beginning days, the Central Intelligence Agency gave financial support to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, because the private contributions were not enough to pay for the stations' services. In 1971, because the CIA funding support was loudly criticized all over the world, the Department of State began supplying the funds, but on a "stopgap" basis. In 1972, the Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting, headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, was directed by President Nixon to learn whether Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty still are needed, in light of the gradual reduction in international tensions of recent years, and then to recommend how to ensure that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty could continue to exist without their being propaganda outlets.

The Eisenhower Commission made its report in February 1973, recommending that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty continue, but under an entirely new structure and financing arrangement. The Commission recommended that Congress establish the "Board for International Broadcasting," with these important duties:

To accept government appropriated funds and private contributions.

To guarantee sufficient funds to accomplish the main job—informing the people of eastern Europe of current affairs.

To serve as the "buffer" between government and the stations, in order that they may remain private, non-government corporations exercising independent judgment in programming. The Board would be composed of five eminent citizens chosen by the President and the chief executives of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, serving ex officio.

To prepare the arrangements necessary for "phase-out" or liquidation of the stations, should the international situation eventually permit. These arrangements would necessarily include employment-termination and accrued pension benefits for the staffs of the stations, as required under the laws of the European nations in which the transmitters are placed, be it

Resolved, That the Communications Workers of America support the thriving continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, to promote the traffic in ideas in eastern Europe; and be it further

Resolved, That this Union urge passage of legislation to establish the Board for International Broadcasting, to provide the necessary guidance to the stations, to assure that the stations will remain private and allowed to exercise independent judgment in programming, and to assure open financial support from private contributions and government appropriations.

STATEMENT FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS HEARINGS ON S. 1914

(By Maury Lisavn, Rockville, Md., Ph. D., School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, 1973. NDEA Fellowship. Dissertation title: "The Politics of Broadcasting to the USSR")

A question that has been repeatedly asked by members of the Committee is what evidence is there that Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe broadcasts actually reach their audience in Eastern Europe and what influence do they have on the policies of the countries. The replies were both positive and negative, but were similar in being imprecise on specifics.

Averell Harriman firmly cited his experience in dealing with the Soviets for his knowledge that public opinion does influence Soviet policies and that even Stalin had not been able to ignore it. Apart from the matter of specific issues at particular times, the general existence of an informed body of public opinion would act as an anchor or ballast on any propensity to adopt risky or adventurous policies, for the simple reason that skepticism about official information would prevent the leaders from automatically justifying any action or sacrifice by the public, unhampered by questions. As the Presidential Study Commission put it, it is "that peace is more secure in well informed societies and that uninformed societies may more easily be manipulated in directions threatening world peace."

Paul Bartlett told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that there was no evidence that broadcasting had any effect in East Europe. Others, former residents of the area, provided many examples of their own and friends' interests in the broadcasts, as well as extensive hearsay evidence, but, according to Dr. Roman Karst, there are, unfortunately, no Gallup polls that could provide the kind of "hard" evidence in which the Committee is interested.

In fact, there are such polls, even if Dr. Gallup did not conduct them, and though they do not meet the standards of reportorial fullness or precision in figures to which Western social reporting has become accustomed. They do, however, provide some "hard" evidence, after allowing for five to ten percentage points of fuzziness around the edges and a certain deliberate obfuscation in the manner in which they were reported.

These polls, which the Soviet Union began to conduct about 1966, were instituted, according to the Soviets' own specialists, in large part because of a growing problem with foreign radio broadcasts, even to the point that research about television had to cede precedence to radio, despite the obvious fact that television was about to become the more important internal medium.

Only the results of the first several years of this polling are available, and these only partially. The reason is clear. The situation uncovered was so distressing that continued publication of the results, although probably not the polling itself, was suppressed. These polls probably were a major cause of the decision to reinstitute jamming of most foreign radio broadcasts in 1968. From 1963 to 1968 the Soviets had felt confident enough about foreign radio to discontinue most jamming, with the exception of Radio Liberty, which remained the only station continually jammed.

At first, the polls avoided direct questioning about foreign radio broadcasts. Instead, they were designed to measure the interest in the domestic media, and, in a roundabout, fragmentarily reported, way, the general credibility of the official, i.e. the only approved, sources of information.

Two significant trends emerged quickly. All Soviet polls, without regard to place, group, or time, showed that the main interest of the public in news was for news about international affairs. These were the sections of the newspapers and the types of magazines that were most read. The polls did not ask why, but some analysis showed displeasure. One Soviet commentator called this interest "unhealthy." In the background, certainly, was the unspoken fact that public interest was pointed into the area where foreign radio had its strongest potential for competition.

A second trend which emerged from the polls early was an indication of considerable public dissatisfaction with the performance of the Soviet press and other official sources of information. The best estimate that can be pulled together from the bits and pieces revealed by a number of widely separate and disparate polls, is that 20 to 30 percent of the public were willing to go on record as being generally incredulous of any official information, while only 40 to 50 percent were completely satisfied in this respect. The remainder either did not care or refused to reveal their opinions.

Since other polls, neutral and avoiding sensitive subjects, rarely showed much over 20 percent genuinely disinterested in news and public affairs, it appears that 10 to 20 percent chose to conceal their opinions in this area. It is much more likely that such concealed opinion was negative than positive.

Some examples of the types of dissatisfaction that appeared in those polls follow. Up to 25 percent of a large group of trainee propagandists, given a chance to evaluate their courses anonymously, indicated that they did not believe the information they were being called on to dispense. In Estonia, only 27 percent of the audience was satisfied with the speed with which the local radio reported the news. From 20 to 40 percent were dissatisfied in varying degrees with the work of the local radio in this regard. In Leningrad 29 percent of the television audience were dissatisfied with either the speed or honesty of television news. Up to 39 percent regretted that they had even bought a television set, and of 12 different categories of programs, substantial dissatisfaction was expressed only with news and public affairs. In Sverdlovsk, the answers to separate questions could be combined to indicate that, even after excluding those who were not interested, 21 to 25 percent of the television audience considered the news not to be worth watching.

The connection of such figures with foreign radio broadcasts is mainly in the basis used by the public for comparisons, especially in categories like promptness of reporting. While the Soviet public has a number of unofficial sources of news, such as contacts with foreign tourists, foreign students in Soviet institutions, exhibits, etc., it is clear that the widespread awareness of the slowness of Soviet news could only come from familiarity with reports from foreign radio broadcasts, and indeed, the official reporting of the Estonian polling took note of this, while regretting that the relevant direct questions on this subject had not been asked.

These polls reflect opinion from below, but testimony also comes from above, when, shortly before jamming was resumed, the top organs of the Party began to give vent to opinions on the effects of foreign broadcasts, which were normally never aired in public at this level, by local officials of the Central Committee's Department of Propaganda, the body directly responsible for counteracting foreign broadcasts. One such view, from *Kommunist*, the main theoretical organ of the Central Committee, follows:

"Now, everyone has radio receivers—you listen to whom you want and as much as you can stand. Only some, although very few such, listen and are off: to somewhere 'there'—that other, beautiful, life . . . Of course . . . this certainly does not mean that a bad man is in front of us. Simply sometimes he believes the tales, or else, even when not believing them, begins to wag his tongue. Some only

'wag,' but some take it seriously. And after that, from the alien voice, he goes off to convince others, to tell all sorts of fables. So one must clear up all this at the very beginning. Here no one will replace the Communists.

Before such expressions were allowed to appear in journals of great authority the Party already had in hand the results of what it said was the first poll ever made of the direct effects of broadcasting in the area of international affairs. It was also, as far as public disclosure was concerned, the last. Conducted under the relatively bland heading of "sources of international information," it queried more than 5,000 interviewees, carefully selected by "statistical grouping" techniques to be a geographical and social-economic cross-section of the country.

Asked what it was about Soviet broadcasts of international news and analysis that interested them, the largest response was that it was the opportunity to compare the Soviet versions of events with foreign radio broadcasts. The percentage expressing this interest ranged from 49 for collective farmers to 75 for students, with ordinary workers and engineering-technical personnel falling in between at 57 and 72 per cent respectively. This represents the minimum number who hear about the news reports of foreign radio, although it is unlikely that nearly that proportion are listening directly, if only because there were not enough short wave radio receivers available at the time. In all classes this was the most important reason for listening to international news; the second most important was to get concrete facts from Soviet broadcasts, and third was interest in analyses and commentaries, this generally getting only a little more than half as much interest as comparisons with foreign broadcasts. The poll also confirmed the frequently reported impression that officials were the most interested of all in the contents of foreign broadcasts. Over 81 per cent of "Party and government officials" replied that they were interested, although it can be presumed that many of these could get the information by other means than those used by the general public.

The poll then asked whether the listeners considered that Soviet broadcasts satisfactorily answered foreign broadcasts. Except among collective farmers there was a large negative response. It ranged from a minimum of 31 per cent of the workers, to 47 per cent of the students, and 49 per cent of engineering-technical personnel. These figures are minimums, because the ambiguous way in which they were reported left open the possibility that they were actually higher.

Thus, the Soviets confirmed what they already suspected, that they had a massive credibility problem, and it could be attributed in large part to foreign radio broadcasts.

The trends measured by these Soviet polls refer not to a single station, of course, but to the totality of Western broadcasting. The Soviets have been careful never to be too specific about individual stations effects, other than claiming that there are about 35 "hostile" broadcasters, almost half apparently never named. Figures provided by the Presidential Study Commission (p. 19) suggest that RL and RFE are responsible for about 55 per cent of all Western broadcast hours to East Europe.

The only quantitative measures of the Soviet estimates of the relative importance of the different stations have been developed by counting the number of Soviet attacks on them. This is usually not proportional, however, because Soviet publications have specialized roles in the various counter-campaigns, and they vary for reasons not connected with the individual importance of the stations themselves. But there was one Soviet magazine, RT, which, before public rejection caused its collapse and alteration, had a primary assignment of countering all foreign radio broadcasting. Its editors may have had secret polls to guide them in the selection of targets. The figures that can be derived from RT's work suggest the following Soviet estimate of the relative importance of individual foreign broadcasters: Radio Liberty—30 per cent; Voice of America—30 per cent; BBC—15 per cent; Deutsche Welle (official station of West Germany)—15 per cent; all others—10 per cent.

Chairman MORGAN. Thank you.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STOESEL. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 1:23 p.m. the committee adjourned.]

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1974

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met at 10:15 a.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Thomas E. Morgan (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman MORGAN. The committee will please come to order.

We meet this morning to resume hearings on the bill, H.R. 8144, authorizing appropriations for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Before we begin today's testimony, I should like, without objection, to include in the record a statement I have just received from Prof. Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs and a former ranking State Department official.

[The statement referred to follows:]

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
RESEARCH INSTITUTE ON COMMUNIST AFFAIRS,
New York, N.Y., July 27, 1973.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like very much to submit for the record of your hearings on Bill HR 8144 a statement on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, with whose activities I have been familiar for many years, and on their relevance to the situation in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and to current developments in East-West relations.

Since time is so short, I am taking the liberty of forwarding the text of my statement within the next day or two without awaiting a reply to this letter.

Thanking you for a consideration of this request, I am,

Sincerely,

ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI, *Director.*

STATEMENT OF PROF. ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI, DIRECTOR OF THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE ON COMMUNIST AFFAIRS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, TO THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

In reflecting on the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, it is useful to raise the following questions:

(1) Are the Radios telling the truth, and who is so afraid of the truth?

So far, no one has been able to impugn the veracity and accuracy of the broadcasts, not even the Radios' most severe and malignant critics. That the Communist governments object to a full coverage of their domestic affairs is surely a reflection on them, not on the Radios.

(2) Are the Radios doing something that no other radio stations are doing?

Yes, no other external radio stations provide such extensive coverage of domes-

tic East European and Soviet affairs and the East European and Soviet mass media remain subject to unprecedented censorship.

(3) Is it in the interest of the United States for the East European and Soviet public to be better informed?

Absolutely; for less than \$.20 per person annually, the United States is in the position of being the main source of truthful communication to about 350 million people—a situation which gives the United States extraordinary leverage and influence. Over the years, the Radios have shown a real capacity for influencing attitudes and opinions leading toward greater moderation within the Communist system.

(4) Is this compatible with détente?

Yes, because a true détente is possible only if the East European and Soviet peoples cease to be the objects of intense and one-sided indoctrination. Truthful and free communication is much cheaper and more effective than weapons.

(5) What are the East European and Soviet governments doing about this?

They are jamming the Radios, but they hope that we will help them by ending the broadcasts.

(6) How could the East European and Soviet governments put the Radios out of business?

Easily, by lifting their domestic censorship and letting their peoples have free access to information. The reason that the Radios have a widespread audience is that the governments in question fear free thought and open communication. By providing such truthful and open communication, America is rendering a crucial service to these peoples and is promoting a more stable and more open global community.

[From the Washington Post, July 1973]

ROBERT G. KAISER FROM MOSCOW: A DISPATCH THAT COULD NOT BE PRINTED
IN A SOVIET NEWSPAPER

Moscow.—This dispatch could not be printed in a Soviet newspaper because the official censor forbids publication of "information about the organs of Soviet censorship which discloses the character, organization and method of their work."

This is only one of a great many subjects that cannot be mentioned in the Soviet news media, according to a partial list of forbidden topics that has become available here. The list suggests the gulf that still separates East and West in this era of détente.

The censor forbids reports on prison, on low morale in the army, on the activity of the secret police on the amount of crime in Soviet society, on accusations made by foreign states or statesmen against the Soviet Union.

It is against the rules to report on "the number of fires and their victims," or "the number of illiterate people," or "the correlation between the cost price of services for foreign tourists in the U.S.S.R. and the selling price of tourist trips to the U.S.S.R."

The list goes from issues of state—no reporting is allowed on the movements or stopovers of members of the ruling Politburo—to issues of entertainment and sport. For instance there can be no stories about the rates of pay for sportsmen, about the money prizes for sportsmen for good results in sport, (or) about the financing, upkeep and staff of teams." (In the Soviet Union, all athletes are considered amateurs.)

A COMPILATION

For a regular reader of the Soviet press, this list provides no new information. It is merely a compilation of many of the subjects that are never mentioned in the papers here.

Soviet journalists accept censorship of this kind without evident discomfort. They regard themselves as propagandists—a word that has no negative connotation in modern Russia—whose job is to support, and sometimes to improve, the status quo.

Bad news makes bad propaganda, so it seldom appears in the papers here. Airplane crashes aren't reported, unless foreigners are among the victims. Floods, earthquakes and other natural disasters also pass unnoted in the media here.

The other forbidden items on this list over aspects of Soviet life that the regime regards as private, not the business of any foreigner, and often not the business of ordinary Soviet citizens either.

A failure to report some of these things openly does not mean they are kept secret. Any visitor to this country can easily discover, for example, that he is paying about \$20 for a hotel room that would cost a Soviet citizen no more than three rubles—four dollars at the official exchange rate.

The Soviets believe in washing dirty linen in complete privacy in most instances. Thus, the censor forbids stories on "the number of uncared for children" and "the number of people engaged in vagrancy or begging."

Stories on "the number of drug addicts" in cities or regions, or in the country, are forbidden. So are reports on "illness in the population from cholera and plague (even isolated cases) . . ." No news, please, about "occupational injuries."

The rules reflect official caution. They ban any story about "new methods and means for treating and early diagnosing of malignant tumors in humans without permission of the Ministry of Health."

A Soviet journalist once told an American colleague that a story about a possible new cancer cure in Pravda could cause tumult in the populace, because Soviet readers are not used to the stream of optimistic—if unfounded—forecasts of Western doctors and scientists.

AND, NATURALLY

Not surprisingly, the censor regards military topics as sensitive. He forbids stories about "the export to foreign countries of arms, ammunition, military technology. . . ." There can be no reports on foreigners' receiving military training in the Soviet Union, or about Soviet military missions abroad. No stores are allowed about bad morale in the ranks, bad relations between officers and men, or "large-scale dissatisfaction among (military) personnel provoked by dissatisfaction with material conditions and the feeding of the men."

The censor rules out stories on prisons, prison camps, juvenile trials and many related matters.

National pride is protected by bans on stories concerning economic credits the Soviet Union receives from foreigners. The censor also bans specific reports on Soviet foreign aid. The national and local budgets, the buying power of the ruble compared to foreign currencies and other economic information are not allowed.

If a Soviet citizen would like to try to learn something about these subjects from foreign radio stations, the local press can't help him. The censor specifically prohibits "information about the audibility of radio stations of foreign states in the territory of the U.S.S.R."

Chairman MORGAN. Testifying this morning in behalf of H.R. 8144 are Mr. I. J. Spilners, president of the American-Latvian Association and designated representative of the Joint Baltic-American Committee, and Mr. Aloysius A. Mazewski, president of the Polish-American Congress.

Unfortunately, the third witness who was scheduled to appear today and whose name appears on the hearing notice, Hon. Philip Klutznick, was unable to attend this session owing to an unavoidable conflict which arose at the last moment.

We will begin with Mr. Spilners. You have a prepared statement. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ILGVARS J. SPILNERS, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN-LATVIAN ASSOCIATION, AND REPRESENTATIVE, JOINT BALTIC-AMERICAN COMMITTEE

Mr. SPILNERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity given to me to testify before this committee. My statement is on behalf of the Joint Baltic-American Committee with reference to the authorization of the 1974 budget for Radio Liberty.

In my statement I want to emphasize a special condition of the Baltic people in their homelands, and furthermore I would like to make a specific request and explain the basis for this request.

As the House Foreign Affairs Committee takes up the question of authorization of the 1974 budget for Radio Liberty, the Joint Baltic-American Committee respectfully requests that consideration be given to initiation of Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian language radio broadcasts at Radio Liberty.

The need for radio broadcasts in the Baltic languages is recognized by Radio Liberty and the State Department, as shown by the 1974 budget proposal, which included \$270,000 for these broadcasts. However, the entire sum was subsequently eliminated from the budget by the Office of Management and Budget.

The Joint Baltic-American Committee is formed by the Lithuanian American Council, the Estonian-American National Council and the American-Latvian Association for joint action and expression of views of Baltic Americans through their nationally elected officers. I have been selected from these elected officers to respectfully ask the committee to adopt the following:

(1) A statement of policy that the Baltic language radio broadcasts at Radio Liberty should be initiated at the earliest possible time.

(2) A recommendation that supplemental funds should be appropriated for the initiation of the Baltic broadcasts or that part of the appropriated funds should be used for this purpose.

First I would like to express a few opinions on freedom of communication. Freedom of the press does not mean that every news medium satisfies everybody. Freedom of the press, however, guarantees conditions, that allow a sufficient number of different and independent news media, which vary in their interpretations of what are important news and what ideas should be propagated to exist.

We can find a very wide acceptance, at least in the United States and Western Europe, of the principle, that freedom of the press is essential to the existence of a free society. This holds true in respect to the relations of the people within one nation and also of the people of different nations. This principle is based on the experience, that communications, contacts, and exchange of ideas help in the long run to give a better life to everybody and lessen tensions among peoples and governments. It is true, that in the short run, at least in the initial stages and in communications with people, who are not used to free exchange of ideas, some strong differences may result. These differences, however, are less dangerous than a perpetuated state of ignorance.

The declared U.S. Government policy in relation to the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe is that specific steps should be taken to encourage the free movement of people, ideas, and information. It is a fact of life, however, that the Soviet Union denies these opportunities of freedom to the people under their rule and also to all other people who may want to have a closer and freer contact with the people under Soviet rule.

The Soviet Union is succeeding in suppressing free communications even in countries where no Russian troops are stationed. An example of this is the recent arrest of nine Baltic leaders in Helsinki, Finland. On July 5 of this year, Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers, was addressing the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on freer movement of people, ideas, and information. At the same time, the unwilling Finnish police following the orders from the highest authorities in the Finnish Government, were arresting the Baltic leaders

in their hotel rooms. Among those arrested were six U.S. citizens, including Dr. J. Valiunas, president, Baltic World Conference and the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania; Mr. I. Pleer, president, Estonian-American National Council; and Mr. U. Grava, president, World Federation of Free Latvians.

The arrests without any charges followed the arranged visits of the Baltic leaders with several delegations at the Conference, where they raised the question of annulment of the Soviet-German (Molotov-Ribbentrop) Treaty of 1939, which was the basis of the Russian invasion and occupation of the Baltic States. They had appealed to the delegates that the Conference declare, that the Baltic States have been illegally incorporated into the Soviet Union, and that the right of the Baltic people to their independence and freedom must be restored.

Angered by this appeal, the Russians requested the arrest of the Baltic leaders, and the Finnish Government obliged. However, thanks to the appeals of several members of the U.S. Congress and the intervention by Secretary Rogers, the Baltic leaders were released from jail 1 day later. In Helsinki they were followed by the Russian KGB, and the friendly and protective Finnish police. They were allowed neither to make and receive telephone calls, nor to meet with newsmen.

This incident shows that the spirit of free communication and exchange of ideas is not practiced everywhere. The Russians succeeded to suppress the spirit of freedom even in the conference city, where a new, freer spirit of freedom should have been born. It does not mean, however, that we have to accept the present Soviet position, or that it may not be influenced to undergo changes in the future.

With the permission of the chairman I would like to leave copies of the more detailed text of the treatment the Baltic leaders received in Helsinki and would make them available to anybody in the committee who wish to see the details of this incident.

[The material referred to follows:]

[Additional statement submitted by the Joint Baltic-American Committee, August 1, 1973]

THE BALTIC QUESTIONS AND THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

ARRESTS OF THE BALTIC LEADERS IN HELSINKI

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe convened in Helsinki, Finland, on July 4 of this year to deal with a situation that is a legacy of World War II. The present occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union is a result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact (Soviet-German Treaty) of 1939 and, therefore, a legitimate question of European security today.

Since the Conference may adversely affect the future of the Baltic nations without the Baltic people having an opportunity to voice their wishes, nine representatives of the Baltic World Conference, who reside in the United States, Canada, England, and Sweden, attended the Conference.

During this Conference the Baltic representatives personally met with many delegates in Helsinki. These meetings were a continuation of earlier contacts established through the respective foreign offices and embassies. The Baltic representatives in the United States had already presented their requests, memoranda and a collection of important official documents to the U.S. Department of State in May, 1973.

The Baltic World Conference had also planned and received a permission from the Finnish authorities to hold a press conference at Hotel Intercontinental on July 6. On July 4, one of the Baltic representatives, Mr. U. Grava, President of the World Federation of Free Latvians, was invited to attend a reception held at the Embassy of East Germany. There he exchanged a few words with

Mr. A. Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, and other diplomats in regard to the Baltic question.

From the very beginning of the Conference, the Soviet Union had provided the Finnish Government with names of the Baltic representatives in the West, who might come to Helsinki. The nine Baltic representatives were continuously followed by the Finnish police and were confronted with several attempts of provocation from the Russian secret police (KGB) agents. On the night of July 4, Soviet Government requested the Finns to arrest them. Finnish Government met in an emergency session on the same night and decided to honor Soviet request.

On July 5, from 10:30 a.m. to about 6:00 p.m. the nine Baltic members of the World Baltic Conference were arrested in their rooms and hallways of the Hotel Intercontinental, questioned and held without any charges. While Mr. I. Ploor, President, Estonian-American National Council, was being arrested and led away by the Finnish Police, U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. William P. Rogers, was passing by. Mr. Ploor informed him about the arrests. The nine arrested Balts were held in Espoo prison outside Helsinki in isolated cells, where they announced a hunger strike. During the interrogation of Mr. Grava and Dr. J. Valiunas, President, Baltic World Conference and Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, by the Finnish police, a non-Finnish, German-speaking observer was present, who asked if Mr. Grava had attended the East German reception and had talked to Mr. Gromyko. The Finnish officials attempted to discredit the arrested Balts by implying that they had carried false documents, had distributed leaflets and had terroristic intentions. Members of the Finnish police force, however, were sympathetic and asked not to be blamed for the arrests, which had been ordered by the highest authorities. Arrested were: Mr. Uldis Grava (US), Mr. Ilmar Ploor (US), Mr. Paul Reinhardt (UK), Mr. I. Kahar (Canada), Dr. J. Valiunas (US), Dr. J. Genys (US), Miss E. Zilionis (US), Dr. A. Telvens (Sweden), and Dr. A. Vileisis (US).

At the beginning of the arrests, several Baltic leaders had managed to inform their families and friends in the United States and Sweden. Members of press, the U.S. Department of State, and members of U.S. Congress were also informed.

The U.S. Department of State officials and members of Congress established contacts with the U.S. Embassy in Finland. Secretary Rogers personally intervened on behalf of the arrested Balts and requested the release of U.S. citizens. Finnish Government met in another emergency session to act upon his request and decided to release and expel the U.S. citizens from Finland. The six American citizens were permitted to leave, but they refused to return to freedom until the other members, citizens of Canada, England, and Sweden were also freed.

After a 24-hour hunger strike all nine Balts were released on July 6, and the decision to deport them was cancelled. The Finnish police even collected money to feast them in a restaurant. They were held under constant surveillance, however, and told not to participate in any political activities; their previously approved press conference was cancelled. Furthermore, during the first eight hours after their release they were not permitted to call anybody—not even their families, and they were not to be interviewed by newsmen and correspondents. Even during the final meal in Helsinki at the Hotel Palace restaurant, they were constantly watched by Finnish agents as well as the Soviet KGB, including the highest member of the KGB in Finland, Mr. Alexander Mihailovich Krahen, officially the Second Secretary of the Soviet Union Embassy in Finland, and Petr Lillenuurm, an Estonian-born specialist in "dirty tricks."

After the official release of the Baltic representatives, however, the role of the Finnish police had changed. If they had complied with the orders to curtail the freedom of movement and speech of the Balts before, now they had taken upon themselves the task of insuring the security of each individual Baltic representative in order to protect them from eventual harassment by the Russian KGB personnel. Many Finns privately expressed sympathies and support for the Baltic freedom cause.

There are several significant observations in the Helsinki Conference:

(1) Confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States political powers ended with the victory of the U.S.—Secretary of State, William P. Rogers, succeeded in releasing the Baltic representatives.

(2) There seem to exist only two significant powers in the world's political scene: Mr. Gromyko ordered the arrest and imprisonment of the Baltic representatives; Mr. Rogers ordered the release of the U.S. citizens of the delegation. Other countries, whose citizens were also members of the Baltic Nine, namely, England, Canada and Sweden, were not particularly concerned about the fate of their citizens in this confrontation of power.

(3) The free press of the world was interested in the actual incident of the arrest and release of the Baltic representatives. It did not attempt to describe and/or clarify the reasons for the presence of the Baltic representatives at the European Security and Cooperation Conference in Helsinki, or the Baltic problem *per se*.

Before leaving Finland, the Baltic representatives placed a bouquet of flowers in Finnish national colors on the grave of the Finnish national hero, Marshal Mannerheim, and expressed their sincere hope that Finland succeeds in maintaining its independence.

Mr. SPILNERS. The United States is in a position to trade with the Soviet Union. This trade should be linked to the interests of the United States in free communication and travel. Our sympathies should be with the free spirit and not with the censorship, and our actions should reflect these sympathies. This is the reason why the Baltic Americans, as represented by the Joint Baltic-American Committee, support Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe, and Voice of America.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND THE PRESENT SITUATION OF THE BALTIC STATES

To convey the significance and meaning of news and communications, such as serviced by Voice of America, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Europe, to the Baltic people, it is necessary to review the history, culture, and the present situation of the Baltic States. It may give a better insight into the sentiments and character of the Baltic people.

The Baltic people in their history have had continuous contacts with Poland, Sweden, Germany, Finland, and other Western European countries. These contacts have given them a Western outlook on civilization.

The Baltic people have been much more exposed to different ideas than, for example, the Russian people, by their nature, they are also more individualistic in their character and behavior, and have had an experience in democratic government. The Russian people, on the contrary, have lived for centuries only under autocratic or dictatorial governments without any opportunities for similar experiences.

The Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian languages are very different from the Russian, Ukrainian, and other languages which are used in the broadcasts of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. Written Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian use the Latin alphabet as opposed to the Cyrillic alphabet used in writing Russian. The Baltic languages are used by the respective Baltic people in their daily communications, cultural life, and literature, but their use is limited by the orders of the Soviet Union Government in the affairs of local government, industry, and education. Many Baltic people know some Russian.

Since the Soviet Union Government imposes the use of the Russian language, this creates resentment and resistance to the acceptance of the Russian language as a means of communications. The Russian language is considered by the Baltic people as a language of their conquerors and masters. Because of this the Russian language Radio Liberty broadcasts heard by Baltic audiences would always be subconsciously or emotionally suspect and would not find the necessary audience acceptance.

The Baltic people do not view their present conflict with the Soviet rule primarily as an ideological struggle but rather as a struggle for survival as nations.

In 1961 at the 22d Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., a program which outlines the duties of the party with regard to national relations was accepted. It states the following:

The deeply rooted Communist system creates a new phase in the relations of nations inside the Soviet Union which is characterized by further national contacts and the achievement of their final complete unity.

The program explains the need for "wiping out national differences, chiefly the linguistic ones," encouragement of Russian language as a "common language" of all peoples of the U.S.S.R., waging war against all manifestations of non-Russian nationalism, customs, and traditions. Also "national discrimination" against the appointment of officers and functionaries of "other nationalities"—that is, Russian national—must not be tolerated.

The policy actually reaffirmed the earlier policy statements of Joseph Stalin (1949) and is most pronounced in non-Russian areas of the Soviet Union.

The policy of Russification has been carried out by establishing new Russian colonies by displacing non-Russian. For example, the westernmost part of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic in the northern part of the former East Prussia. It is separated from Russia by Lithuania, Latvia, and White Russia. The rapid influx of Russians into the Baltic States, along with the establishment of a Russian colony in East Prussia, is suspected by the Baltic people to have been planned to Russify the Baltic States and secure the area forever as an integral part of Russia.

The party leadership, cabinet posts, and industry are dominated by appointed Russians arriving from outside of the Baltic States. They are given special privileges in selection of living quarters which are very scarce. Russian dominance in the leading positions in government, party, and the diplomatic corps is typical of the whole Soviet Union.

The Soviet Russian writers are allowed to claim that they carry on literary traditions of the great Russian writers of the past. The pre-Soviet attitudes of the latter are no hindrance to the publication of their works. But only a very limited number of the pre-Soviet Baltic classical writers are "acceptable." The literary works of "nonacceptable" writers may not be republished regardless of the contents.

Russian children who go to Russian schools in non-Russian parts of the Soviet Union do not need to know the language of the country; but the non-Russian children must have daily Russian lessons.

As a result of the preceding, and many other privileges that the Russians enjoy, the Soviet Union is considered by Baltic people a continuation of a considerably expanded czarist Russian empire which has been organized according to Communist principles in political, cultural, and economic life. The Soviet Government is aware of this thinking and therefore has tried to keep the Baltic States more isolated from outside contacts than other areas.

I am going on to the possible role of Radio Liberty Baltic language broadcasts. The Voice of America broadcasts emphasize events in the United States and world events related to the U.S. interests. Its broadcasts include also programs which link the ethnic interest of people in the United States with the interests of the people of other countries. Voice of America broadcasts in all three Baltic languages and finds a very wide audience in the Baltic States. Numerous personal cor-

respondences and contacts leave an impression that everybody, including the Soviet hierarchy in the Baltic, at some time listen to the Voice of America broadcasts.

The Radio Liberty broadcasts are known to the Baltic people, but they do not find as wide an audience as the Voice of America broadcasts. The Baltic audiences have reportedly received many important and interesting news items from Radio Liberty. They include the news about self-immolations of Lithuanians as a national protest, demonstrations against the Russian occupation in Lithuania, the letter of protest signed by 17,000 Lithuanians against religious persecution, the letter of protest by Latvian Communists against Russification, excerpts from the underground Chronicle of the Catholic Church of Lithuania and reports of persecutions and imprisonment of individual Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians.

Radio Liberty has prepared research papers on different aspects of present day life in the Baltic area.

If Radio Liberty would broadcast regularly in the Baltic languages, its audiences in the Baltic area would increase many more times. The basis for this anticipation is the interest of the people of this area in happenings in their homelands and adjoining areas about which the Soviet Government does not report. Since the news reports in the Soviet press, radio, and television consists, to a large part, of formal Government announcements of wordy and ideological speeches, news analysis and commentary on the news would also be a significant attraction. Even reading of old classical or forbidden present day Baltic literary works would attract new audiences.

This opportunity to learn more about news near home, the forbidden phases of history and the past and present literature, has been given to many people for many years by the broadcasts of Radio Liberty in 18 different languages. The same opportunities, however, have not been given to Baltic audiences.

And finally, general policy with respect to the status of the Baltic States.

Radio Liberty was created to broadcast to the Soviet Union. The U.S. Government and the Baltic people do not recognize the Baltic States as a part of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the Baltic language broadcasts, if such would be authorized and initiated, should be directed to the Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian people but not to Soviet Lithuanians, Soviet Estonians, and Soviet Latvians. To find any acceptance by Baltic audiences and support by Baltic Americans, Radio Liberty would have to follow the same policy of nonrecognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union as the Voice of America is following now.

Thank you. That is the end of my statement.

Chairman MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Spilners.

Mr. Spilners, the question of Baltic language broadcasts was discussed by the committee yesterday. It is my understanding that there is general agreement, by both Radio Liberty and the State Department, that these broadcasts should be undertaken. I am certain that most of the committee supported that. The problem, as I understand it, is primarily a budgetary one: if a higher priority were assigned to the Baltic nations, some other nationality broadcasts would have to be cut back. Do you feel that the Baltic broadcasts should have a

higher priority than some of the present broadcasts that are now going into the Soviet Union?

Dr. Eisenhower testified yesterday that there are about 175 distinct languages and dialects in the Soviet Union. I wonder how you compare what is being broadcast in these languages with what you feel should be going into the Baltic countries.

Mr. SPILNERS. Well, I do not wish to judge what language broadcasts should be carried on by Radio Liberty. I just want to emphasize that the Baltic people constitute nations which are westernmost in the present situation in the Soviet Union and of course they had their independence, they were members of the League of Nations but they are in an unhappy situation now that nobody wants to talk about what happened, how the independence was ended by the Soviet Union and the countries annexed. This seems to be against the present orthodoxy to speak about them and it seems that it is no fault of anybody in particular that Baltic broadcasts were not started, but as the circumstances were such they were not considered to be a satellite by our Government and therefore they did not get any Radio Free Europe broadcasts. At the same time they are not being recognized by the U.S. Government as being a part of the Soviet Union. They are left in between two chairs and there was no special broadcasting organization created for the Baltic broadcasts; so they have been left without any.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Spilners, do most of the citizens of the Baltic nations understand Russian as a second language, so they can understand broadcasts by Radio Liberty in Russian? Is there any urgent need of broadcasting in a second language to the Baltic nations?

Mr. SPILNERS. Their being between Germany and Russia most of them can speak some other language. I mean the intelligencia, the educated class anyway, but as I pointed out in my statement they should not be likened to the Russian people. This is no denunciation against the Russian people, but the Baltic peoples just want to maintain their own national identities to which they believe they have a right.

Chairman MORGAN. Thank you, Mr. Spilners.

Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Spilners, you made a very persuasive case in your statement. I hope that some way can be worked out so that there can be broadcasts in the Baltic languages.

I would like to ask you about the nature of the Baltic languages and their relationship to Russian. You say the alphabet is different. Is the basic grammatical structure the same? Are the words the same but with different alphabets? Can one understand Russian if one speaks Estonian or vice versa? Or is it a question of learning separate languages?

Mr. SPILNERS. No, it is a completely different language. There are certain basic similarities between the Lithuanian and Latvian languages which both are considered a part of the Baltic language group, only these two languages remaining. Other groups which spoke languages similar to the Latvian and Lithuanian are extinct now. Estonians, however, speak a Finnish type of a language which is more related to Finnish and Hungarian; but Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians are not Slavic.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Can a Latvian understand a Lithuanian?

Mr. SPILNERS. Well, easier than he would understand Russian. He would recognize some of the words, but he would not be able to communicate freely. I mean it is a state where there is sufficient difference to make them distinct languages. They, Latvian and Lithuanian, both are distinct languages and they are very, very old languages, the people having lived in that area on the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea for maybe a couple thousand years or so.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The chairman referred to different dialects in the Soviet Union. We are not talking about dialects when we talk about the Baltic languages.

Mr. SPILNERS. No, we are talking about distinct languages. I know in central Asia you have again completely different languages than in the western Soviet Union. The Baltic languages are not Slavic languages. Like with many languages, you can find similarities in a few words with German and Russian and so forth but without studying, without thorough study as you would study a foreign language, Baltic people would not understand Russian.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Your testimony here today reminds me of a very pleasant encounter my family and children had in Leningrad four summers ago. We saw a group of young people waiting in line to get into a restaurant. They looked different from the people we had seen in the street—they were dressed better, they were physically more attractive and they were even enjoying their wait. We asked whether any of them spoke English and right away several of them said yes and so we engaged in some conversation. They came from Estonia. It was quite evident to us that they seemed to have lots of vitality, and they were proud of their differences. I suppose Leningrad gets a fair number of travelers from the Baltic States. It made us wish that we had been able to get to that area.

Thank you very much.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Zablocki.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I join with you and our colleagues in welcoming Mr. Spilners. I want to also commend him for his statement.

On page 5 of your prepared statement you note that "Numerous personal correspondences and contacts leave an impression that everybody, including the Soviet hierarchy in the Baltic, at some time listen to the Voice of America broadcasts."

First of all, let me make it very clear that I support Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. However, I understand that the Voice of America primarily reports on incidents that occur in the United States. In your opinion shouldn't the Voice of America also report U.S. reaction to events in the Soviet Union, particularly in the Baltic States? For example, I am specifically referring to the incident in Helsinki, Finland, involving the arrest of a number of delegates. Do you know whether the Voice of America reported that incident since there was reaction in this country?

Mr. SPILNERS. Yes; Voice of America did report this. Since this was carried in the American news media and international news media it was carried by Voice of America as a report that I guess came off the lines of UPL. Of course Voice of America has a permanent reporter in Helsinki and I assume he covered the conference. The news media gave a short report on the incident but very little, if any, coverage of the reasons behind the incident.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the Voice of America beam its reports in the languages of the Baltic States in Latvia?

Mr. SPILNERS. Yes; they have ever since, I believe, over 20 years anyway. I mean since the beginning of the fifties, I believe.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Although it would be ideal if we could put your recommendations into effect, budgetary limitations will not permit that. In the meantime, however, would you agree with me that we ought to increase Voice of America native-language broadcasts to the various Baltic States on incidents that occur in those countries?

Mr. SPILNERS. Well, that would be nice; we certainly appreciate the Government is supporting Voice of America broadcasts in the Baltic languages but the Voice of America in their broadcasting are restricted by certain rules and regulations what they can broadcast and what they cannot broadcast. There are many happenings related to the Baltic which I would say would be news to anybody in the Baltic States. But it still would not be a news item appropriate for the broadcast over radio or the Voice of America, and this makes a difference. I suppose there cannot be interviews and news reviews and news analyses relating directly to the Baltic political interests or to the interests of that particular area of Europe. Everything has to be related to the U.S. interests and to the U.S. official policy.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Let me ask you one final question. To what extent has the Voice of America invited participation by such groups as the American Latvian Association to make statements over Voice of America in Latvian?

Mr. SPILNERS. Yes, I have been interviewed but my statement here, for example, could not be broadcast by Voice of America.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The very fact that you testified before this committee could not be broadcast?

Mr. SPILNERS. The fact may be but I don't believe that the full text of my statement could be translated and broadcast. Anyway, from my experience, Voice of America has interviewed me only in respect to the ethnic cultural life, social life, maybe professional life of people of Latvian origin here in the United States.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I sincerely hope Voice of America would change its policy somewhat.

Mr. SPILNERS. I hope they would in relation to broadcasting philosophical or political or any of that type of questions.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Doctor.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Gross.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve my questions for Mr. Durkee or Mr. Sargeant or both. I assume they will be available.

Chairman MORGAN. They won't be testifying today, Mr. Gross.

Mr. GROSS. When will they be testifying?

Chairman MORGAN. We would have to schedule them later on. We have just the two witnesses scheduled today.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would the gentleman yield?

Chairman MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If we have time, would it not be possible—

Chairman MORGAN. I think you ought to give them some time to get prepared.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. There may be some comments they would like voluntarily to make. I don't mean that we should dragoon them.

Chairman MORGAN. If they are willing to volunteer after the two witnesses testify, the Chair certainly will hear them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is it proposed to bring Mr. Eisenhower and the adviser of the Commission back?

Chairman MORGAN. If the gentleman so requests.

Mr. GROSS. I would not do so for myself alone. I suppose everyone else is satisfied.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Nix.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, first of all my apologies for being late. I am not going to ask any questions but I am going to indicate my interest. I am interested in knowing out of these hearings the substantive matters, informational, that the representatives think should be transmitted over that station—those matters that would be of interest and helpful to the United States of America—but that question I will ask later.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Spilners, just for a moment I wish to return to the point that Mr. Frelinghuysen raised and that is to give you a chance to reemphasize the complete difference in languages between Russian and those of the three Baltic nations. Specifically again—you correct me if I am wrong—I want to reemphasize your own point that Latvian, Estonian, and Lithuanian are all non-Slavic languages.

Mr. SPILNERS. That is correct.

Mr. DERWINSKI. These people then are not Slavs and if we are to communicate effectively with them it should be through their language and not Russian which is a language that the Soviets are attempting to impose upon them, is that correct?

Mr. SPILNERS. That is correct, yes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Now would you care to address your attention for the benefit of the committee to the deliberate program of Russification that is being carried on by Soviet authorities in the three Baltic States?

Mr. SPILNERS. Yes; I would like to reemphasize this particular aspect. You have to view the whole situation in the Baltic as a people who are struggling to retain their national identity.

When you look at the history of Russia or the Soviet Union today, you can see the Russians have always tried to get to the Baltic and occupy the area. But since maybe the times of Stalin they have recognized, and Stalin has emphasized this in his speeches in 1949, that the rulers cannot hold together the Soviet Union or the Russian empire—that would be a better description of this particular type of government—unless they make the country homogeneous in respect to population, economics, and so forth, and that, of course, requires having just one people but not several who have aspirations for their own identity and their own national independence. As long as these different nationalities and different nations do exist, this homogenizing cannot happen.

The Baltic States are in a way considered by the Soviet Union, by Russians, as a very strategic area. We believe this is a very outmoded outlook on the affairs between different nations. I believe Holland and Belgium can live very peacefully with Germany and have good trade and have transit and so forth without Germans occupying Hol-

land or Belgium. I believe that the Baltic people can live very peacefully and have trade and give transit to the Russian trade or to the transit of persons and have good communications if we have independent Baltic countries and Russians have their own country whichever way they wish to.

I believe it is an old-fashioned leftover idea from the past centuries that for the Soviet Union or for Russia to exist and to be powerful they need all these surrounding areas which are non-Russian and which they consider essential for their existence. I hope that increase in communications between different nations will also educate the Russian people that they don't have any right to occupy non-Russian areas unless there is a mutual and a really free agreement to join in some sort of a real union of nations.

The Soviet Union as it exists today is not a free union of nations, it is just a collection of occupations by the majority nation which has been going on for centuries and is being continued today. It does not agree with the United Nations principles or with the general principles of more civilized nations.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Thank you, Doctor.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Biester.

Mr. BIESTER. I have no questions.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. No questions.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Whalen.

Mr. WHALEN. No questions.

Chairman MORGAN. Thank you, Dr. Spilners.

Mr. SPILNERS. Thank you.

Chairman MORGAN. The next witness is Mr. Aloysius A. Mazewski, president of the Polish-American Congress.

You have a prepared statement, sir, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ALOYSIUS A. MAZEWSKI, PRESIDENT, POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the matter before this honorable body is of primary importance to both the U.S. leadership of the free world and to millions of people living in the shadow of the Communist totalitarianism forced upon the nations of East Central Europe by the Soviet Union.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty on whose future you will make definitive decision, and in a larger sense, a fateful decision, are not mere broadcasting facilities, international in scope. Nor are they propaganda tools in the struggle between the world and Communist sophistries for minds and hearts of modern man.

But during the most difficult period of the cold war, both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty grew into respected cultural institutions with the vital mission of bringing truth, light, and hope to the nations sentenced without guilt to life under Communism which is abhorrent to their heritage of European culture and history.

In the words of the report of the Presidential Study Commission on International Broadcasting—

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty * * * gives citizens of the communist countries information on conditions, attitudes, and trends within their own

countries and on international developments as they relate to the special interest of the listeners. Radio Free Europe programs supplement and correct the news issued by the media within their audience areas, and they supply alternative analysis, based on careful research of facts and conditions in the listener areas, as well as on Western sources not normally available to East Europeans.

The importance, relevancy, and administrative structure of both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are lucidly explained in the Commission's report entitled "The Right to Know". Its significance and validity is enhanced by the fact that it has been prepared by such distinguished Americans as Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Dr. John A. Gronouski, Dr. Edward Barrett, Dr. Edmund A. Gullion, and Dr. John P. Roche—men of singular standing in the highest educational areas of the United States.

Mr. Stewart S. Cort, chairman of the Radio Free Europe Fund contributed further enlightenment in his address entitled "Radio Free Europe Is an Era of Negotiations".

I am not going into the details incorporated in both documents. I will only add that the Polish-American Congress, a central and representative organization of Americans of Polish ancestry is in full accord with them.

I would like to, however, with your kind indulgence, add a few remarks from the human side of the news as they relate to the matter before this honorable body.

We take for granted and seldom do we fully appreciate the freedom of information and discussion that we enjoy in our open society. It does not strike us as unusual that various Communist publications have free access to the United States and we can buy them practically everywhere. We are not particularly appreciative of the right to know which we enjoy, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights promulgated by the United Nations is taken by the majority of us as reaffirmation of a known fact of life.

We do not realize what it means to be deprived of the right to know, the right to objective information, the right of justified criticism and dissent.

The full impact of the violation of these rights are deeply and tragically felt by the people of East Europe where the Orwellian nightmare of the big brother began in 1945 and solidified its totalitarianism through outright lies, distortions of truth or at best, insidious sophistries.

We in the free world do not fully realize what it means to long for truth, for objective news and commentaries, for self-expression and free exchange of ideas.

We in the free world do not fully realize what it means to live in the vast gray area of suppressed truth or in the artificial glare of totalitarian propaganda.

Americans of Polish origin and heritage have countless, unofficial and more or less intimately personal contacts with the Poles living in their homeland. From this experience we know that the Radio Free Europe broadcasts are to them like a breath of fresh air, like a ray of truth piercing the stagnant fog of Communist doctrine, and they are like a message of hope telling them that the free nations of the West have not forgotten them.

With strictly controlled and limited points of distribution for a very few Western publications, the Poles in their homeland are not

allowed to read newspapers and magazines of the West. Even Polish-American publications such as, for instance, the Polish Daily Zgoda, the New Daily and the Polish Daily and numerous weekly and semi-monthly publications are strictly forbidden by the Red regime in Warsaw.

They can get the objective news and commentaries primarily through Radio Free Europe. In view of this fact the significance of Radio Free Europe transcends other considerations and ill-conceived reservations. It stands like a beacon light of truth, of freedom of the right to know; it implements the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; it stands as an eloquent testimony behind the proposal of the Western nations for the European Conference on Security and Cooperation that free exchanges of ideas, cultural, economic and sociopolitical values between East and West be one of the main pillars of peace and progress.

For these reasons, I appeal to you earnestly, distinguished members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a legislation that would insure the permanency of Radio Free Europe and for appropriations needed for the transitory period to which the fate of this great radio facility of America's goodwill of free world leadership be decided.

Thank you.

Chairman MORGAN. Thank you, Mr. Mazewski, for a very strong statement on behalf of the bill.

Yesterday members of the Eisenhower Commission were here and discussed the question of Radio Free Europe's reputation in the countries of Eastern Europe. Specifically the question was raised during the hearings whether the name of the station should be changed because it invoked memories of the cold war and has become tainted over a period of years. Former Ambassador John Gronouski, who was a witness, strongly argued against such a change. He stated that it was his experience in Poland that the name stood for accuracy, for objectivity of reporting. Would you concur in this view of Ambassador Gronouski?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. I certainly would because the Ambassador had the actual and practical experience of being there, I can further confirm it by people who come back here, by letters that occasionally are slipped through that I get that say it is a must for a person in Poland to listen to Radio Free Europe. He wants to, even the officials listen to it. I think any change in the name would possibly have adverse effects in one way or another, but I would concur with whatever the Ambassador said in this matter.

Chairman MORGAN. Then you feel that Radio Free Europe enjoys a positive image in Poland compared to other Western stations?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. I certainly do.

Chairman MORGAN. It is now well established that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are almost entirely funded by the Government. Since 1970, with the CIA no longer funding their operations, the two radios have not been regarded as "private" stations in any sense. Is it your impression that this has in any way damaged the credibility of the broadcast?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. I doubt that it damaged it very much, possibly to a certain few individuals, but I believe that it was more or less a general

opinion amongst people that money must come from somewhere and as long as it is paid and the fact that CIA financed it, it was still Government money, so I don't think that there was much damage, if any.

Chairman MORGAN. What in your opinion makes Radio Free Europe distinctive from other Western broadcasts? Do you feel that the people of Poland, for instance, would place greater reliance on Radio Free Europe than perhaps the Voice of America or British Broadcasting Corporation or other stations they hear? Do you feel they place greater reliance on what they heard on Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty than the other stations that are beamed in there?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Personally from the contacts and from the people I talked to and from the letters that I did receive it is my personal opinion that they believe more in Radio Free Europe because the Voice of America has a different mission than Radio Free Europe and frankly there are few. Like in anything else we have differences of opinion but I would say that the large majority would sustain Radio Free Europe.

Chairman MORGAN. I want to thank you, sir, because your remarks are very important. I know your organization is very progressive and well run. I know that you have many contacts in Poland and in that part of the world. Your strong endorsement of this program carries a great deal of weight with me.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Thank you, sir.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should like to thank Mr. Mazewski for his statement also.

I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Zablocki.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to welcome Mr. Mazewski and to commend him for his testimony. I think the prestige of his organization, the Polish-American Congress, adds to the favorable consideration of the proposal.

As I said earlier, I intend to strongly support H.R. 8144. However, there are some who maintain that perhaps because of the détente between the United States and the Soviet Union and the improved relations with Eastern European countries, the continuation of Radio Free Europe may prevent further developments which would be in the best interests of the United States. Would you care to comment?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. I certainly would. I think that it would help. It would not prevent, because it is a subject that is necessary in order to convey the message to the people themselves, and in any way whatsoever on a point of this type it would not hurt the dealings with the Russians. Of course they are mainly concerned to quiet the stations down, to shut them down, but they have no concern whatsoever of shutting their own stations down and information that they are beaming from their own point of view. I think it will only strengthen the fact that if we continued to do so it will bring out a more enlightened citizen in their particular countries. It will also show a position of strength on our part and not a position of capitulation.

Capitulating on this and completely forgetting the Eastern European people would be just like selling out their mind. They are under communism not because of their free will because they want to—as a matter of fact, the Poles have fought not only in Italy with the Amer-

icans, they fought throughout. They did not have a country to return to and they were told, well, this is going to be under Russia, period. Morally speaking I think it would be a terrible affront that we would just forget them and should give them the free right to think, the right to decide themselves what is right or wrong. At least we should give them the information and let their mind be active and not be a captive of one particular country or captive of communism.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. President Mazewski, is it not true that while the people of Eastern Europe are very anxious to hear of developments in the United States over Voice of America they desire even more to learn of what is happening in their own country and this can only be made available to them over Radio Free Europe?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. But there are instances that show that because of Radio Free Europe they came out with instances that happened in their country and their controlled press had to also bring this up which ordinarily they would not do. As a matter of fact, I have some relatives I have never seen in Poland and people come back and say, "I heard you on Radio Free Europe" or "I heard you speak on Radio Free Europe and we listen to it diligently and we listen to it every single day, particularly when the news comes on," and I think that is something. I hear this also from officials who to them it should be taboo and the only way they can know things, information about their own country, is through this source and that is Radio Free Europe.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the Polish communication media found it necessary to correct the news as a result of what was beamed over Radio Free Europe, then apparently the local media admitted the truth was beamed over Radio Free Europe?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Public opinion forces them to at least admit it in part.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It would further encourage the media in the future to report positively and factually?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Mazewski, I recognize the fact you are appearing before us as president of the Polish-American Congress but you do also maintain constant liaison with leaders of Czechoslovak, Hungarian, the Baltic States and other national groups as well. A point that you make in your prepared testimony is the growth of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to respected institutions. Do you feel that their perpetuation is essential to our purposes and that of the people in Eastern Europe?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. I believe so. I strongly agree it is essential to perpetuate it. I think that it is for the common good. I think that it is a better way of spending money than to spend money on arms and ammunition and later have problems. I think it is a good way of presenting our philosophy and our news. I think it is a necessity, and I think purely in terms as an American.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Now you make a special point that Polish-American publications are in effect forbidden in Poland.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Yes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Which is really a form then of censorship. Is it not true though that the Communist Governments of Eastern Europe are quite diligent in attempting to infiltrate and influence thinking of

Polish Americans, Lithuanians and other American groups who still feel an attachment to the land of their origin? Is not in fact the Communist attempt to propagandize continuing in the fullest fashion?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. There is no question that there is definite infiltration in the various ethnic groups. One theory in mind is to have them turn favorable to the particular Red regime and thereby then letting the bars down and then assuming the status quo and particularly even to the extent of fighting Radio Free Europe and things of that type. We have information, we have good sources on this, we have instances that we can actually prove this. Particularly there is one Polish paper that does cater to the Communists particularly and that is in the city of Detroit. So naturally they are concerned; why shouldn't we be concerned?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Now since we are in a period of supposed détente, have you noticed my legitimate liberalization of the domestic policies of these countries behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. You mean as to information—

Mr. DERWINSKI. No, as it applies to freedoms that they have heretofore deprived their peoples of. Do you see any real growth in areas such as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. I see the limited freedoms that would not hurt their particular philosophy but I have not seen any freedoms in a true sense of the word where they would accept our daily newspapers and our information in their country. I cannot speak for the citizens of Poland but I can only speak from what observations I have made that the conditions are a little better under the present ruler than they were prior thereto, but by saying something that has been real bad and then say it is a little better, it is a relief, does not say it is good but it is a little better but not as to their actual freedoms that we call freedoms and that we enjoy.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Now your organization maintains constant contact with the people who leave Poland and those who visit Poland. Therefore you feel you have an accurate pulse of public opinion there and it is often expressed to you when it can't be expressed there.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. It is true because we get a daily—as a matter of fact, I have just talked to one individual and he was very callous about the whole thing, and when he got back he now has a greater concern and a greater appreciation actually of America and he knows why we are trying to do these things and he is more concerned in helping us to aid in our organization and our constant fight for free and independent Poland.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Nix.

Mr. NIX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Mazewski, it is obviously not a violation of the law to have receiving sets in Poland.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. True.

Mr. NIX. Is it a violation of the law to receive the messages from these sources that we are talking about?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. You mean if there is a law specifically on the books that says they cannot listen to this?

Mr. NIX. That is correct.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. I am not familiar with whether there is a law but they are discouraged from listening to it and it is not done in an open fashion.

Mr. NIX. In what form does the discouragement take?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Well, I don't know what they will be doing to them, but I have not heard of any incident myself where somebody was arrested for listening to the particular broadcast.

Mr. NIX. Now, a value of the broadcasts, as I understand it, is you say that it gives the citizens of Communist countries information on conditions, attitudes, and trends within their own country. By that you mean that they are not familiar with the attitudes and trends and conditions in their own country?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. True, because the press is limited and so is the television and radio. They are told what they are supposed to know, not what they should know.

Mr. NIX. And from what you say, the assumption is that the information received from outside is accurate, and the information received from the press of that particular country is inaccurate.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. That is not a correct statement in this respect, that the information that they might be given them is accurate at that particular time which they want them to know, but they completely forget the information that they should give them that the citizens ought to know, and at times I am sure that they color it to such an extent that it would be inaccurate. We have instances where Radio Free Europe came out with actual information, and then this forced their particular news media later in time to bring out, and in one fashion or another to partially substantiate, what Radio Free Europe has said, in order that they will have some credibility amongst their citizens.

Mr. NIX. Well, don't you think that the information given by that particular Government is what they deem to be the kind of information that should be distributed among their citizens?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. No question. As a matter of fact, I have been interviewed by one of their press and have gotten positive assurances, and I have had questions submitted to me so I would not be misquoted, and the next thing they came out with in the press was completely different, things that I have not said and things that even though the questions were answered and I have copies of it, and they will fit it into their own pattern of what they think will be best for their particular cause.

Mr. NIX. Now, Radio Free Europe takes the role of enlightening the people of all of the countries to which it distributes its news: is that not correct?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. That is correct.

Mr. NIX. That, in effect, is an interference, in my judgment, with those who are in authority in these countries; is that not true?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. That is not true. I would not call it interference. I think that seeking of truth is not interference. I think the telling of truth is adding to the individual's right to know, and I would not call it interference in the strict sense of the word. In a dictatorial country or in a Communist country, if then you say that we are interfering with them, that would be correct.

Mr. NIX. The right to know, of course, is a controversial issue.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. True.

Mr. NIX. Even here in this country.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. True.

Mr. NIX. And what is truth is also a controversial issue, is that correct?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. I would go along with you on that.

Mr. NIX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Whalen.

Mr. WHALEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nix anticipated the question that I had in mind and had really intended to raise yesterday. That is, are there any sanctions or legal penalties imposed on those who are discovered listening to the broadcasts, and your answer, as I understand it, is that there are none to your knowledge.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. At this particular time, I have no information that anybody has been incarcerated. Prior to that time, there have been people that have been forbidden to do it. There is a relaxation.

Mr. WHALEN. This question occurred to me, I suppose, as a result of seeing so many World War II movies dealing with the underground.

I just wanted to add my thanks to you for appearing here this morning and for your contributions to the committee's deliberations.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Thank you.

Mr. WHALEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Biester.

Mr. BIESTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I also would like to join my colleagues in my appreciation of your testimony, since the Shrine of Czestochowa is in my congressional district, and Father Michael I regard as a friend.

My awareness of your activities, sir, is considerable, and the activities of your Congress are commendable, and I salute the work that you are in.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Thank you.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Mazewski, I, too, want to thank you for appearing before us today. I, also, have a sizable Polish-American population in my area that are intensely interested in what goes on back in their former homeland.

We have heard some testimony about the numbers of people who listen. Has your organization at any time attempted to estimate the number of listeners that avail themselves of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. No. We did not make any surveys. All I can say is that there is not a person that we talk to that does not listen to it at one time or another, and the letters I receive—we receive quite a number of letters that get through—say that they listen. We did not make any survey whatsoever like the surveys that are conducted by the agencies here in the United States; no, sir.

Mr. GILMAN. Have you visited Poland in the past few years?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. In the particular position I am in, I find it not convenient to visit Poland yet.

Mr. GILMAN. Can you tell us if you have any information of the number of radios per family? We have heard some testimony here of some estimates of the number of radios per family in Europe generally, and I was wondering if you had any information with regard to that.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. No, sir, I don't. No. I am not familiar with the number of radios, but I certainly could find out.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Steele, do you have any questions?

Mr. STEELE. Will there be another hearing, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Sargeant, president of Radio Liberty, and Mr. Durkee, president of Radio Free Europe, are here. Unless they want to make some comments here and submit to questions, this will end it.

Mr. STEELE. In view of the time, I will hold my questions for them, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Zablocki.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. This question does not relate to H.R. 8144, but I would like to take advantage of Mr. Mazewski's presence before this committee. I wonder if I could ask him his opinion and evaluation of a program sponsored by the USIA in its exchange of the magazine America and the Polish-edited magazine Poland. Because of priority considerations due to budgetary problems, there has been an indication that the magazine America may be discontinued. I believe this is a very valuable communication media. There are people in the United States anxiously awaiting the editions of Poland, and I know there are many people in Poland anxiously awaiting the editions of America.

Mr. Chairman, may we have Mr. Mazewski's observations and evaluation of the publication America and whether it should be continued?

Mr. MAZEWSKI. I received the message just a couple of days ago with the particular news that there is some talk about discontinuing it. I personally feel it would be a mistake because it is a wonderfully edited magazine and it is something that is permanent and it is not a fleeting word. We are concerned about it because I think the effect that that magazine has on the good relations is insurmountable and it cannot be measured in a way and we are strongly for the continuation of that magazine.

I was coming here to Washington figuring I would find out more about it and to express my desire and the wishes of our people that if there is any way possible to save it because we have found it to be a very pleasant piece of information that is received by many, and many that are not Poles, and those that receive it in Poland look forward to it. I think that it would be a sign of going a step backward instead of forward and we are very much for the maintenance of that magazine.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAZEWSKI. Thank you.

Chairman MORGAN. At this time, without objection, I want to file for the record a statement submitted by the Honorable Stewart B. McKinney of Connecticut in support of the bill.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of H.R. 8144. Despite recent attacks against the contemporary effectiveness of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, I feel that the creation of a Board for International

Broadcasting will answer these charges without compromising our long-standing commitment to provide uncensored information to the peoples of the world.

For more than 20 years, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have broadcast 1000 hours per week, bringing the news and music of the West to all who would listen. This record of constant service is the best possible testimony in favor of continued support for these organizations.

However, it is said that, while they have been effective in the past Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are embarrassing symbols of Cold War hostilities which are anachronistic in the age of détente.

First, I would hesitate to abandon all our Cold War defenses until there are no longer attempts to jam Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty broadcasts. Millions of people depend upon the services of these two stations for news and ideas suppressed by their own governments.

But more important is the role of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in a world situation which holds the promise of lasting peace. I believe that removing Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty from CIA control and creating a Board for International Broadcasting will allow these organizations to shed their Cold War symbolism. Then they will be able to provide the information and establish the communication essential for meaningful international accord.

As the bill states, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights gives us the right to receive and transmit information "regardless of frontiers." Just as the President's recent summit talks with Mr. Brezhnev, and the Helsinki Conference, have opened new lines of communication between nations, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty function as America's broadcast summit meeting with the Communist bloc nations.

Of course, as the world situation evolves, hopefully toward peace, the information needs of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty listeners change as well. Under the supervision of the Board for International Broadcasting, these organizations will have the day-to-day flexibility necessary to keep pace with developments in international relations.

I am confident that the five presidential appointees along with the chief operational executives of both Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty will give the Board the expertise and judgment that will make these organizations invaluable tools in the construction of a lasting peace.

I have received many letters from my constituents urging your strong endorsement of this bill. Some, whose families still reside behind the Iron Curtain, relate their deep appreciation of the inestimable contribution of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty broadcasts toward the cause of freedom. Others feel it would be a rejection of our ideals of open communication and a tactical error to sacrifice two effective beacons of Western thought without gaining something in return.

Mr. Chairman, détente does not mean that we must compromise our ideals; it does not mean that we must abandon the millions who depend upon us for the truth. Rather, it means that free and open lines of communication must exist between all the peoples of the world so that misunderstanding does not endanger delicate, new friendships.

I believe that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty now have a greater part to play in the maintenance of good foreign relations than ever before, and for this reason I hope that you will report favorably on H.R. 8144.

Chairman MORGAN. Are Mr. Sargeant and Mr. Durkee willing to take the stand to make short oral statements and be subject to some questions at this time?

Mr. SARGEANT. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MORGAN. Mr. Howland Sargeant is President of Radio Liberty and Mr. William P. Durkee is President of Radio Free Europe.

If you wish, Mr. Sargeant, you may lead off and make an oral statement to bring us up to date. Then Mr. Durkee may make a statement. After that we will address you as a team in the question and answer period.

STATEMENT OF HOWLAND SARGEANT, PRESIDENT, RADIO
LIBERTY

Mr. SARGEANT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, listening to the testimony of Mr. Spilners and Mr. Mazewski this morning and the remarks of Milton Eisenhower as Chairman of the Study Commission and his fellow commissioners has brought back pretty much to my mind my feeling when we got the reports requested by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress and from the General Accounting Office evaluating Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. The testimony was in fact so flattering that I began to wonder whether this was the kind of eulogy you get only as you pass from the scene in this world or whether it was going to be a living memorial.

The only remarks I think I would like to make would be these. First, I have the advantage, I think, of being the only man who has ever been responsible both for the official radio, the Voice of America, in my former incarnation as an Assistant Secretary of State, and for a radio such as Radio Liberty which is now in its 21st year of broadcasting exclusively to the Soviet Union.

I think I have come to the conclusion that if you are going to talk about international broadcasting there are two questions you should ask. The first question is: Is this radio audible among the people to whom it is directed? And your second question is: Well, if it is audible, is the substance of what it says interesting enough so that people actually listen to it and is it worth something?

On these two questions I think we have not brought out the fact in previous testimony that Radio Liberty's transmitting installations—which are in the Rhineland in Germany, on the Costa Brava in Spain and in the northwest tip of Taiwan—are facilities that were chosen exclusively for the purpose of broadcasting to the land mass of the Soviet Union, a sixth of the Earth's surface. They are not like those of most international broadcasters who are trying to reach either all of the world or many different parts of it. They are exclusively targeted and from sites that are picked because they have the best characteristics for getting that signal to the audiences.

Further, it has not been brought out that Radio Liberty in its site in Spain uses more power than has ever been employed before in shortwave voice broadcasting. We use 1 million watts of power on a highly efficient curtain antenna with an over-the-water reflecting path. Believe me this is a very powerful signal. At the best propagation times it reaches the Soviet Union from the Baltic to the Black Seas and goes pretty well east into the area of the Ural Mountains.

The second question that then arises: Well, if you can get your signal in and you have all kinds of competent engineering evidence that says indeed it is an extremely powerful signal, do people listen to you? Well, you can't make the kind of Nielsen survey or other polling that you can make in the United States or Western European countries, but you can take the testimony of people who have been listeners, people who are still there.

I noticed that Milton Eisenhower quoted their great writer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, saying that if we ever learn anything about events in this country—that is, the Soviet Union—we learn about it from

I also noted, although I don't think Dr. Eisenhower made the point, that Mr. Solzhenitsyn gave that interview to two American foreign correspondents; one of them was Hedrick Smith of the New York Times and the other was Mr. Robert Kaiser whose recent Washington Post article was discussed here yesterday.

Now we also have evidence from interviews with travelers that go back and forth to the Soviet Union, from attacks on Radio Liberty by an official Soviet media, from listener mail that comes to addressees in the West. We know that the radio is heard, we know that there are about 34 million shortwave sets in the Soviet Union because Radio Moscow home service itself broadcasts on both medium and shortwave in order to reach the 11 time zones of the U.S.S.R. Therefore, if the regime wishes its own radio to be heard, there have to be sets with the capability of receiving the frequencies in the shortwave bands that Radio Liberty uses.

Finally, we are getting a little closer to the point where you can get a sample of Soviet citizens—not emigrés, Soviet citizens—who come out of the country and will be going back. We have recently had a study completed by a polling organization which did not know for whom the study was being made. Questions were asked of Soviet citizens about listening to Western radio broadcasts in the Soviet Union, and this, as far as I know, is the largest sample of Soviet citizens that has ever been developed on this specific question.

The study found, among other things, that about 70 percent of all the Soviet citizens in this sample actually do listen to foreign broadcasts. About 6 out of 10 of them actually were listeners to Radio Liberty. We found, surprisingly, that there were a large number even of Communist Party members who are in this sample. We found that about 40 percent of these Communist Party members listen to Radio Liberty. So you have evidence that the message is heard.

I think I ought to add that we have had some questions about the role of the Voice of America and the role of these radios. Voice of America broadcasts concentrate, in accordance with their mission, on presenting American policy, interpreting and defending it, and presenting the American scene. I have said for a long while that if you take a week's broadcast in Russian, as we do periodically, of VOA and Radio Liberty side by side, you can see how they differ.

The important point is that at least 50 percent of everything Radio Liberty broadcasts in Russian deals with the internal events in the Soviet Union, especially those that have a genuine meaning to a husband or a wife, or their children, to the family in the Soviet Union. That figure is 60 to 75 percent when you consider Russian feature broadcasting alone. The VOA broadcasts for this same period will show about the same concentration on events in the United States, on American policy, on American foreign relations.

I have developed the belief from my experience with both these radios that they are like a pair of shears, each one is more effective because the other one exists. They are like the two cutting edges of a pair of shears and I think that they operate to reinforce each other, not to duplicate.

Finally, we have had some discussion, and I think it has been well taken, on what languages are used by these radios, including the, I think, very persuasive statement of Dr. Spilners about the Baltic languages. Now our problem quite frankly is one with which you are very

familiar. It is a question of money. I have as of this day, the first of August, directed a formal letter to the Broadcasting Corporation of China on Taiwan from which Radio Liberty rents transmitters and antenna systems so that we can reach somewhere on the order of 20 to 30 million people in the far eastern Maritime Provinces and along the road of the trans-Siberian Railroad as far west as Lake Baikal and the area of industrial dispersion.

I have told the Broadcasting Corporation of China that we will have to give formal notice of terminating an agreement which I negotiated in 1955 with them because if the House Appropriations Committee 10-percent cut in the request that is pending here before this committee stands—and as you know the House has approved that committee report—there is simply no way in which Radio Liberty can live within its budget. I am trying to do those things that will not damage the core of permanent personnel.

Radio Liberty in some ways is unique among all international broadcasters to the Soviet Union in that if you looked at our programming in Russian this week and you took all of our feature programming, you would find that more than 20 percent of this is done by people who are living today in the Soviet Union. These of course are principally the authors of these documents called samizdat who want their constitutional rights respected. Now another portion of Radio Liberty's programming is done by people who have come out of the Soviet Union in the 1970's.

We have to make some very difficult choices, and what I am trying to do is to protect this unique reservoir of talent even at the expense, as I say, of having to go off the air in the Far East to this potential audience of 20 to 30 million Soviet citizens because we are just caught in the vise of the devaluation of the dollar.

Three years ago when you went into the Munich airport you got 4 German marks to a U.S. dollar. One week ago a friend of mine in that airport got 2 German marks to a U.S. dollar. Since 80 percent of our expenditures are made in foreign currencies and two-thirds of these are made in German marks you can see the kind of squeeze that we are in. A 10-percent cut in the budget request is the equivalent to roughly a 25-percent cut in the ability to sustain our programs.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is all that I should say but I will be glad to try to respond to any questions.

Thank you.

Mr. ZABLOCKI [presiding]. We will hear from Mr. Durkee.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM P. DURKEE, PRESIDENT, RADIO FREE EUROPE

Mr. DURKEE. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Sargeant has covered a lot of ground so I will not repeat. I just want to make three quick points.

One, that the people who run Radio Free Europe are professionals. No matter what their national origin has been they belong to professional journalist unions both here and abroad, and they consider themselves not emigres or refugees but professional journalists.

I might cite a Bonn correspondent with the BBC. During the course of an interview he was asked, "How does RFE compete so successfully against the domestic radios; that is, the radios run by the regimes and the parties?" And his answer was simply, "Because they are a much

better radio organization. They are extremely well equipped. They are very professional." That is what we think we are, and that is what we intend to keep ourselves.

Two, I call your attention to our policy statement in the appendix of the Commission's report found on page 83. I think you will find that an excellent document, which explains what we broadcast, what the character of our broadcast is, and some of the self-restraints employed in the course of our professional broadcasting activities.

The third point I want to make, to emphasize what Mr. Sargeant has said, is that the financial problem—though, I think, in large part no fault of our own—has become acute as a result of the devaluation of the dollar. The facts are that the House figure—if it were finally voted—represents exactly what we spent in fiscal year 1969, had the value of the dollar remained constant. And this is in spite of the fact there has been a 25-percent increase in the cost of living since that time. So financial problems are acute.

I also note that in your fact sheet about us, which you have before you, on page 7 there is an accounting of our employees and their average salaries and grades, which I think you will find not extravagant.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, gentlemen.

One of the criticisms of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe is that the broadcasting beamed to the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries allegedly lacks objectivity and that it is politically edited and therefore results in provocative programs.

Mr. Sargeant, would you care to comment?

Mr. SARGEANT. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I would first say that to a regime that depends upon controlling information that reaches its own citizens, anything which deviates from what they would like their citizens to receive may very well be considered provocative. However, all of the various studies that have been made, including that by the Congressional Research Service, including that by Dr. Eisenhower's study commission, have found that the broadcasts of Radio Liberty and of Radio Free Europe meet the highest standards of objectivity.

I have found no confirmation in any objective study of which I know to sustain that criticism.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Durkee.

Mr. DURKEE. Yes, I would like to comment from a little different direction. I agree with everything that Mr. Sargeant has said. One of the aspects, I think, of Radio Free Europe and I think Radio Liberty too, is the wide range of subjects that are covered. We have had in recent months a series of interviews with various people around the world on various subjects of interest to any intellectual in Eastern Europe. A book entitled "Can We Survive Our Future?" contains articles and interviews that appeared on Radio Free Europe which were published quite freely by a British publishing company.

Now these are from leading intellectuals—from Arnold Toynbee and other intellectuals throughout the world. They would not be broadcasting on Radio Free Europe if they did not believe we were broadcasting objectively and professionally; you would not get those people.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Durkee.

Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think the committee is lucky to have these two anchormen as witnesses. They have made a very helpful contribution to the testimony we have received.

I don't mean to cast any reflection on Mr. Durkee, but Mr. Sargeant was particularly eloquent in his obviously extemporaneous statement and it has been very helpful.

It disturbs me somewhat to learn of the plans for a drastic curtailment of your activities, because it does not seem to me that this is desired by those who believe these programs are worthwhile. I would think there is very substantial support for them.

Could I ask the basis for this decision? Is the level of funding provided under the continuing resolution inadequate to support the operations from Taiwan?

Mr. SARGEANT. No, sir. I am taking what I think my trustees and I consider a reasonable, prudent fiscal position here in that, if the \$15 million figure which has been voted by the House on the basis of the report of the Committee on Appropriations stands, we clearly cannot support the programs that we have in being today, even with the most severe economy measures that we have instituted not only in the current fiscal year but that we began with the mid-February devaluation of the dollar.

Now, what I am really doing here is giving the required formal notice. I have to give the Broadcasting Corporation of China 6 months' notice of our intention to terminate. During that 6 months I have to bear all of the normal expenses of the rental of the transmitters and so on. At the end of that time, if the 6 months' notice period has expired and the fiscal position has not improved, then I have relieved us of the liability for the remaining 5 months; that is February through June of the fiscal year 1974.

This is in line with other actions we are taking which are reversible, we hope, if later this year the congressional action is better than is forecast by what the House has already done in approving their Committee on Appropriations report.

Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN. I am interested in your metaphor about the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe being a pair of shears which reinforce one another. This raises in my mind what the relationship should be. Does there need to be so many entities involved in these operations? A subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee has been considering the authorization for USIA and there may be eliminated from their request money for new facilities in the Far East.

You also refer to facilities in the Far East, and Dr. Eisenhower said there was a need for a modernization of facilities in Europe. Quite obviously there are substantial capital needs with respect to international broadcasting of one kind or another.

Might we possibly economize in meeting those needs if we could operate facilities for two different programs, even if we didn't have one group run the different programs?

Somebody ought to be worrying about how urgent the need is, and how likely it is to be met from private sources. I doubt very much, as I said yesterday, whether private sources or European governmental sources are going to provide much in the way of assistance to what is essentially an American operation.

Would you have any comments to make?

Mr. SARGEANT. I think Dr. Eisenhower referred to the Commission's recommendation that if the Board they have proposed comes into being, one of the first priorities of that Board should be to obtain an independent competent technical survey of all of the facilities sponsored by the United States in international broadcasting.

I suppose that is the only way we could get a definite answer as to whether something can be done to make wiser use in some joint fashion of the facilities we now have. I would hope that such a technical survey would try to look into the future and say that it is reasonable that the United States ought to provide funds or find means of obtaining facilities that will keep us competitive in this international broadcasting field. It should, I think, examine the needs and requirements of all the American-sponsored broadcasters.

You see, what has happened is that in international broadcasting the name of the game is power. I referred to our facilities on the Costa Brava in Spain. Now when we installed our four 250,000-watt transmitters in the fall of 1960 and the spring of 1961, these were the most powerful transmitters that were being used by anybody in international shortwave voice broadcasting.

Today, the poorest republic south of the Sahara who is going to go into international broadcasting—and all of them wish to and most of them are doing it—would really feel that it was demeaning to have power as low as this. The international broadcasters today install transmitters of 250,000 to 750,000 watts of power.

So there has been a technical revolution going on in international broadcasting technical facilities, and Radio Liberty has not since the mid-1960's been a participant in that revolution. I think this is what Dr. Eisenhower was trying to get at in referring to his Commission's recommendation.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You gentlemen were here yesterday when Mr. Eisenhower talked about the Commission's recommendations. Would you care to comment on the role the Board for International Broadcasting will play as you understand it? Perhaps particularly, do you agree with the recommendation that there should be a centralization of effort in the Washington area so there would be close cooperation between the Board and your two radios?

My feeling was, as you will recall, that it might well be better to have a concentration, if there should be one, in the New York area rather than Washington.

I would like also to get your views as to the extent to which you must exercise your own good judgment and discretion in order to avoid taking positions which are contrary to national policy. Do you need the kind of jogging that presumably the Board would provide to remind you of the importance of keeping within such a framework? Isn't this possible without the development of this Board to watch over you?

Mr. SARGEANT. If I might comment on that first, Congressman Frelinghuysen, it is possible to do that because we have been doing it. We have been doing it without the Board, admittedly in a transition situation in which the Department of State has been acting as the responsible agency of the executive branch to justify appropriations, to receive them and to allocate them to the radios in the form of grants.

There has to be, in my opinion, some responsible body in the executive branch that will do this. I have become convinced of this after listening to the debates within the staff of the Commission and consulting various constitutional and other lawyers.

I don't think that the proposed Board is the exclusive way of doing it, but I remain convinced that there does have to be some body, a Federal agency with standing, if the constitutional procedures are going to be preserved.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You mean an agency to receive money to allocate it?

Mr. SARGEANT. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But how about this business of keeping your operations within national policy guidelines so the radio does not go contrary to our policy? Isn't that something you have been doing—in a very capable way, as far as I understand it—without the guidance of a board such as is now being proposed?

Mr. SARGEANT. Well, I have a very simple, perhaps a too simple, position on this, and I will state it. I will admit freely that I didn't persuade the Study Commission nor perhaps a number of others of my position.

My position was this: That the United States has declared several times in recent years publicly that one of the tenets of our foreign policy is to attempt to widen the free flow of information. If in fact Radio Liberty is to be a kind of substitute for the free press that cannot exist in the Soviet Union, I would say that if we are performing as responsible journalists of the air, then it seems to me we are indeed in support of U.S. foreign policy.

This argument, I might say, was not accepted by the Commission and, as I think Commissioner Roche explained, this was the one basic issue that they spent the most time on and had the greatest difficulty in finding a formula that they thought would adequately solve the dilemma.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you very much.

Mr. DURKEE. I would like to remind Mr. Sargeant that I also joined him in exactly the same position, so it was not a unilateral position, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. SARGEANT. I enjoyed your support, Mr. Durkee.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Steele.

Mr. STEELE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargeant, yesterday we had an opportunity to address the question of those languages which Radio Liberty is not broadcasting in to Dr. Eisenhower and members of the Commission, and in particular I questioned why Radio Liberty is not broadcasting in the Baltic languages or in Yiddish.

I wish to say that I was very encouraged by the genuine interest, I think, on the part of the Commission and by Dr. Eisenhower's assurance that we would have a detailed answer as well as a detailed exposition of the Commission's thinking on this subject shortly before us. And there did seem to be a great deal of interest in moving into some of these areas.

Now, I still find it very difficult, however—and certainly the question was not adequately answered yesterday—to accept the position that the reason we have not been broadcasting in the Baltic languages

is a lack of money. It is more importantly a question of priority, it seems to me. After all, you have a amount of money and it is up to you to divide that money up the way you want to spend it.

Why have we chosen over the years to not spend it in broadcasting to the Baltic nations, or for broadcasting in Yiddish? I would point out that we have made the decision to broadcast in five north Caucasian languages, a number of Turkestani languages, where the people on the other end are not as many as those in the Baltic countries, or indeed are not as many as the number of people, according to your own fact sheet, who understand Yiddish.

It seems to me there has to be a number of factors in setting priorities. One has to be, as one of you so ably put it, the number of people who understand the language and whom you technically can reach.

But there is also another consideration, it seems to me, and that is the amount of political ferment among the designated listeners, their receptivity, their need for support, and the value of the support we can provide them.

So I would be most interested in your comments on this.

Mr. SERGEANT. Well, it is a good question, Congressman Steele. The first thing that is missing is the basic ingredient that I had hoped might be responded to when you had Assistant Secretary Stoessel here yesterday.

We speak as though for the 20 years Radio Liberty has been on the air we have not considered Baltic language broadcasts. The fact is, we have considered them a number of times, but the official policy of the United States as it was communicated to me on several occasions—and probably Dr. Spilners can confirm this—was that since the United States did not recognize the incorporation within the Soviet Union of the three Baltic Republics and, in fact, maintained relations with their governments-in-exile in this country, it was inappropriate for a radio addressing itself exclusively to Soviet citizens to be given the mission of using those languages.

I think that it is only within the past 2 years (I may be wrong on this exact time) that the official position of the United States changed—that it became possible for us even to consider doing this. When it became possible to do so, we submitted in our budget request, which went before the Department of State, a proposal for \$270,000 to initiate such broadcasts, and the State Department in accord with its changed policy, supported this.

It was when we reached the Office of Management and Budget, where they had to make decisions to bring the Federal budget within the limitations the President had set, that these and other projects were eliminated.

So we need the background which was not really supplied to this committee yesterday to understand that it is a perfectly reasonable question, "Why for years has this radio been on the air and apparently not done anything about it?" The record is really somewhat different.

Mr. STEELE. So during those 20 years you took very direct issue with the Department of State and U.S. Government policy, I take it, on this issue?

Mr. SERGEANT. Well, we raised the question from time to time but the priorities that we were trying to follow—in addition to the priority that since more than half the population is Russian and since Russian

to some degree is a common denominator that you obviously have to broadcast in Russian—were based on the ethnic populations of the Soviet Union which we felt were going to become of increasing importance.

Now we speak of the Adighe, the Avar, the Chechen, the Karachai and the Ossetain of the North Caucasians as being small in numbers. They are, but they belong, they are primarily Moslem, and because they are primarily related not to the European U.S.S.R. but to this great area we used to call, in my schooldays, Turkestan, or the Soviet Central Asia.

Now, Soviet Central Asia is the fastest growing population in the Soviet Union. The Uzbeks in the census of 1959, who ranked fourth, have in that 11-year period up to the 1970 census surpassed Belorussians, and they are now the third largest nationality. They grew at a rate of about 50 percent in this period of time.

Now in those days when these language choices were being made, no broadcaster in the entire non-Communist world was broadcasting to these peoples in their national languages. Even today, although the Voice of America has gone into Uzbek as of, I believe, September of 1972, still the other five languages of Soviet Central Asia that Radio Liberty uses are used by no other broadcaster—not by the Voice of America, BBC, French Radio, Deutsche Welle, not by Radio Pakistan or India. They are used extensively, though, by Radio Peking and certain other Communist world broadcasters.

So our intention was perhaps a long-term one of trying to reach national components that were likely to be of increasing importance both in their internal pressures in the Soviet Union and, to the extent that they lie along that 4,000-mile border with China, would become populations that were increasingly subject to the contentions of the Moscow and Peking power centers.

Mr. STANLEY. The history notwithstanding, I understand from your testimony that the State Department has withdrawn its objections then to broadcasting in the Baltic languages? That means that you now support such broadcasts, or at least are not opposed to them, if not actively support them. We have the American Baltic Association, which supports them, and I cannot imagine many Members of Congress who would not support them. As a matter of fact, I think that most Members of Congress would be extremely disturbed and deeply concerned if they recognized that all this time Congress has been providing this money, it has in effect been approving or at least permitting the extension of broadcasts in these languages.

We now have, in any case, all the ingredients, aside from the money, which we will address in just a moment, to begin those broadcasts. But even if extra money were not forthcoming, it is not really a question, it seems to me, of getting extra money so we can add these broadcasts. It really continues to be a question of the priorities as to how you want to use the money that you have.

It is my understanding that in this statement Dr. Eisenhower is going to prepare for us, there is going to be consideration given to what kinds of cuts would have to be made and what kind of juggling would have to be done if Baltic languages were to be included without any kind of significant increase in funding. (See page 45.)

That is not to say I am not appreciative of the points you have made. I feel that the funding should be there and I will certainly continue to do everything possible to see that there is sufficient funding. Yesterday the State Department was eager to blame the lack of adequate funds on OMB and I am sure OMB is blaming it on someone else. Your response was a refreshingly candid one. Nevertheless there is certainly a tendency to claim that it was the State Department's resistance all these years. Now that we have got everybody together it seems to me that it is time we move and include those languages one way or another in the broadcasts.

I have used quite a bit of time, but if you could address the Yiddish language question for a moment, I would be most appreciative.

Mr. SARGEANT. Well, as I think you know, Radio Liberty has been over a period of years, the leading broadcaster, other than perhaps Kol Israel, which has broadcast programs of particular interest to Jews in the Soviet Union. RL observes their religious holidays when we would broadcast religious services, and RL beams special programs on certain anniversaries such as the Warsaw ghetto uprising and the anniversary of the murder of Mikhoels, the Moscow playwright and leader at an earlier time of the human rights movement in the Soviet Union.

We did begin in the spring of this year an experimental series of weekly broadcasts in which we had programs of particular interest to Soviet Jews, often with a substantial content of Yiddish. For example, RL covered a play in Yiddish on the London stage and had parts of it performed in Yiddish by the actors, with comments by the producer and by critics in London. We have done a few things primarily in the cultural and the religious fields in the preservation of the historic tradition, but we have not inaugurated regular broadcasts as yet in Yiddish, and again I don't think that we could do so unless there is more adequate funding.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEELE. Thank you.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Whalen.

Mr. WHALEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, the committee has been advised that the radios devote about half of their program time to an analysis of events of interest and concern in the countries to which the broadcasts are directed. Now, in this connection, I have three questions.

First, how do you get information out of those countries, particularly spot news?

Second, how do you verify its authenticity?

Third, do you have anyone on your payrolls, who operates in these particular Balkan countries or in Russia?

Mr. SARGEANT. If I might respond to that first, let me describe how Radio Liberty begins its broadcasting day.

First, it is never off the air. Radio Liberty is on the air 24 hours every day. At the time when people are beginning to get up in Moscow and Western Soviet Union, we have already monitored the internal radio services, Radio Moscow Home Service. We know that there are certain advantages where you have a complete orchestration of the information that reaches the citizens of a country. A particular story on Soviet radio will also be in the press. I think our people are

now so expert in following the internal information control that they can even tell you that a story that was carried in Radio Moscow Home Service this morning will appear this afternoon in, say, the major paper in Georgia in Tbilisi. It is called Dawn of the East, Zarya Vostoka.

They not only tell you the story will appear, but they say it will appear on the front page, right-hand column, and it will run about 8 column inches, and it will or it will not contain the following key points.

As an illustration, when the United Arab Republic decided that they wanted to expel all of the Soviet military and paramilitary advisers, we knew that the Soviet media were not going in that next 24 hours to say one word about it. We knew when the death of Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev occurred, that there was not going to appear in the Soviet media anything about the death of their most recent leader for at least 24 hours. So in this way we scoop Soviet media.

Mr. WHALEN. Just to illustrate the question more specifically, if the Soviet press or the Soviet radio did not give the news of Khrushchev's death, how did you get it? That is really the thrust of my question.

Mr. SARGEANT. We got it, just as other media did, from foreign correspondents in the Soviet Union. We have a firm rule that we do not use a story unless we can verify it from at least two reliable independent sources, which I think is perhaps the answer to your second question and your third question. No, we do not have, we never have had any type of correspondent or agent within the U.S.S.R. itself.

Mr. WHALEN. All right.

Mr. DURKEE. My answer is exactly the same.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Biester.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, this has been very informative to me.

With respect to the polling done so far as listeners of Radio Liberty are concerned, is there any erosion of credibility or failure of credibility which might occur from the sources, the locations at which the transmittal occurs? I note, for example, that transmittal occurs from Spain. Certainly if you say 40 percent of Communist Party members are listeners, do they know that this comes from Spain? And if so, does it have any impact on them that it comes from a country with the history and with the Government that Spain has?

Mr. SARGEANT. I could not answer that categorically. Let me make a general statement. Being involved in international communications for a generation or so, I have come to the conclusion, which seems to be fairly well supported by the leading academic specialists, that the source of the information in the long run is not determinative of the attitude of the receiver. This means that if you listen to a radio—and we have had this experience in wartime—if you listen to a radio even though you identify this radio with the enemy, if the radio proves to give you reliable information that is important to you, you don't care where it is located, you don't even care about its enemy label.

I have a feeling that that is probably the best answer I can give you here, sir.

Mr. BIESTER. I think it is a good answer.

With respect to the samizdat, when you broadcast that material, do you advise the listener of the nature of the material beforehand, and

do you advise the listener of the approximate length of time that the particular samizdat will be broadcast, so that he might take it?

Mr. SARGEANT. Do you mean that on a typical broadcast day, do we in effect give a preview of what the news will contain, and do we say, for example, in the second half hour that there will be a round-table of French, German, and African university students discussing the changes in the curriculums, things of that kind?

Mr. BIESTER. No. Do you give those who might wish to tape record samizdat material, prenotice of its occurrence and approximate length of time it will take place?

Mr. SARGEANT. Yes, we do, and we do this in several ways. First, announcement of samizdat materials to be broadcast is contained in the billboarding of what the next 24 hours of broadcasting will contain. This is just giving you a program schedule on the air, but since we have a weekly schedule, and a listener who listens at all regularly will know that at certain times of the day, a particular feature of interest to him will be aired. He can thus adjust his own listening to a particular time, and he always has alternatives, because in a 24-hour schedule, a particular feature will be repeated several times.

Now I think what you are getting at may be, in part, what we do with a document in samizdat or perhaps what we do when, for example, Stalin's daughter, Svetlana Alliluyeva Stalin, came to our microphone and read chapters of her own book to the listener. This was an event that created enormous impact among the listeners and we did then what we would do now. We not only had the regular periods, but we picked a period in the early morning hours—let's say, it might be 1 o'clock in the morning Moscow time—and we announced that at this time all of our frequencies would be carrying this item. At the moment that the reading was going to begin, we played a haunting trumpet melody called "Snowstorm," which originated in the concentration camps of World War II. This is, in effect, the 30-second sign-on that tells a listener we are about to begin the reading of documents of this kind, which, I suppose, lets them go and get a pencil or possibly turn on a tape recorder.

Is this the answer to your question?

Mr. BIESTER. That is precisely it, yes.

Mr. SARGEANT. Thank you.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargeant. Dr. Durkee, we have all found your presentation quite fruitful. We have been informed in hearing the testimony in the past few days that we now have functioning two radios in addition to the Voice of America. I notice in the report RIAS is functioning and I think you made some statement that we have some other installations dealing with the Far East.

The bill before us, H.R. 8144, provides for the creation of this new agency, the Board of International Broadcasting, and apparently its objective is to more effectively and efficiently utilize the available resources and also to provide a vehicle for funding these continued operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Expanding somewhat on what we discussed with Dr. Eisenhower yesterday, and I think Congressman Frelinghuysen raised it again today, would it not be more prudent and economical to consider expanding this proposal to

include within one agency all of our international broadcasting, the Voice of America, RIAS, and any other broadcasting that we are doing throughout the world?

Mr. SARGEANT. I might simply make a comment on that. It is an attractive and potentially possible concept. I have never seen in recent years a study that has really encompassed all of the U.S.-sponsored broadcasting activities. At one time when I was first in the Department of State after World War II, I was deputy to Assistant Secretary William Benton, and we brought a proposal forward to the Congress to create, in effect, an international broadcasting foundation, one of the purposes of which would have been to include the Voice of America and other American-sponsored broadcasting efforts all within the scope of such a foundation.

It clearly was an idea whose time had not come because it was rejected out of hand. It was opposed by the commercial broadcasters in the country. It found no welcoming ear in the Congress and I have never seen a quite comparable proposal since then. However, Congressman Fascell of this committee has in the past years held a number of hearings at which proposals of this kind have been studied.

I am not aware that any legislation has been introduced, however, that would cover the area that you describe.

Mr. GILMAN. Do you foresee some worthwhile economies in that type of proposal?

Mr. SARGEANT. It is possible that you will find economies, but once you tackle this, you find that it is not quite as easy to take the technical facilities that have been developed for very specific purposes, put them in a common pool and play this like a great Wurlitzer. Very often there are technical obstacles that you can't anticipate until you really look at the nuts and bolts of it.

I still think it is a very worthwhile idea. However, it seems to me to be true that if we really get this study that the Commission recommends on international radio broadcasting facilities and get the facts and figures, we would be in a better position to know whether there would be economies and whether it would be feasible. Therefore, we urge that we get started.

This is the place to start, it seems to me.

Mr. GILMAN. You are referring to page 46 of the Commission report?

Mr. DURKKE. Yes, which calls for the joint study of international broadcasting facilities: Is there any way to economize either between Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, or by including anybody else's facilities, to increase our power, which is a real problem. That study should give us a lead on whether it is a practical possibility or whether we are confined to just renewing our own equipment.

Mr. GILMAN. Has that study been approved?

Mr. DURKKE. I think that is a good starting point and we certainly vigorously back its rapid study.

Mr. GILMAN. I would assume we could expect some recommendations from you by next year.

Mr. DURKKE. We would not be conducting a study. We would certainly be participating.

Mr. GILMAN. What are the prospects, gentlemen, of bringing about some sizable contribution from both the European Communities and

the European private sector? We have been talking in the last 2 days about encouraging this. There has been some talk about meetings with the Western European Advisory Group. There are also some notes in the report about encouraging the private sector in Europe to become involved.

I note that our reports in our committee indicate that the private contributions have been generally declining as the public contributions go up. As a matter of fact, Radio Liberty had \$122 of private contributions in 1973 and Radio Free Europe had only some \$800,000 in contributions as compared to several million dollars in prior years.

What are the prospects and what are your suggestions regarding improving that aspect of financing this project?

Mr. DURKEE. Mr. Congressman, I will respond initially to this. I think the information you have gotten from the previous witnesses has been a fairly realistic appraisal of the situation. I think, as the Commission reported to you, they studied the question in terms of the policy questions involved and concluded this was an American operation, so that there should be no contribution sought in Europe for the operations of the broadcasting of the radio for reasons they stated.

They did, however, recommend that we try to raise funds from Europe for support of our research operations, which are widely used in Europe, and also the possibility of use of those funds for technical modernization. It also recommended that we solicit private contributions in Europe for the same purpose.

The State Department would be in a better position than I to tell you about the prospects of governmental fundraising or contributions in Europe. I believe they have started, as they testified yesterday, and we are attempting to support that effort through private resources in Europe. There has been a discussion now for about a year and a half on that. We have got good people in Europe working on it.

I am optimistic that we will raise some money, though nobody should be under the illusion it will be sizable. It will be a contribution. I think the money is important, but also the fact that the contribution is being made is important. There are people seriously supporting us in Europe and they are willing to spend their time to try to help us conduct our affairs in the future.

In the United States I think the reduction in fundraising this year reflects simply the ambivalence of the situation we found ourselves in. We didn't feel that we could go ahead and solicit funds from the public until there was a clear determination by the Government that the radio ought to continue, and this is a reflection of that entirely.

Mr. GILMAN. I notice some of the private contributions have not been declining just this year, but have been generally declining since 1955. How do you account for that lack of activity in that area?

Mr. DURKEE. Well, I think that there is really no explanation for that except that the fund-raising activities themselves have been—what shall I say—modest, in the sense that there was never an effort made to raise the funds as a life-and-death matter for the radio. I think that the radio has been supported largely by contributions from private industry and there have been over 14,000 or 15,000 industrial concerns contributing.

So it has been a reasonable amount, it seems to me.

Mr. GILMAN. Just one other question. I note on page 9 of the bill that there is some open-end financing for additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for salary and retirement and other benefits and costs. Can you give us some idea of what that amounts to?

Mr. DURKEE. I think that simply refers to—I am not a technical expert, but that would be an authority to come back to you if there were a further devaluation of the dollar after the bill was passed. Indeed, it would be expenses that would increase without our having done anything about it at all, and that is what has happened. Actually, as Mr. Sargeant pointed out earlier, since we submitted the budget and the House acted on it, there has been a 10 percent further increase in the cost of the foreign currencies we use, so that, in effect, when the House made a 10-percent cut, it resulted in a 20-percent overall shortage, and that is why we are in difficulty.

Mr. GILMAN. At this time do you have any idea of what that amounts to?

Mr. DURKEE. Well, the total additional dollars for use since the time the budget was originally drawn up last May make a \$7 million difference; that is, a \$7 million increase just through the loss of value of the dollar—no other increase of any kind.

Mr. SARGEANT. Radio Liberty, that would be over \$3 million.

Mr. GILMAN. In other words, \$10 million for both.

Mr. SARGEANT. Yes, just over it.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Thank you, Mr. Sargeant and Mr. Durkee, for your excellent testimony. Indeed the testimony that the committee heard today and likewise yesterday was most productive and helpful.

The committee stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. DURKEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is always a pleasure.

[Whereupon, at 12:30 p.m. the committee adjourned.]

APPENDIX

CORRESPONDENCE OF HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS; HON. JAMES E. BURKE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS; OSVALD AKMENTINS, LATVIAN PRESS SOCIETY IN AMERICA, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JUNE 22, 1973.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a letter I have received from my colleague, Congressman Burke of Massachusetts, together with a communication he has received from one of his constituents, Mr. Osvalds Akmentins. The appeal registered by Mr. Akmentins for Radio Liberty broadcasts in the Baltic languages (Latvian, Lithuanian and Esthonian) is representative of similar pleas Members of Congress have been receiving from around the country in recent years.

It is my impression that Radio Liberty did have plans to include Baltic language programs in its regular schedule of broadcasts, but was obliged to defer such plans indefinitely owing to budgetary cutbacks in the radio's overall operations.

Since the Baltic language question will undoubtedly be raised by Members of this Committee when hearings are held on the Administration's proposal for public funding of RFE and RL (H.R. 8144), I would appreciate receiving a full status report on this matter for possible inclusion in the hearings record.

It would be particularly helpful to have a statement regarding RL's future intentions in this regard and a detailed explanation of what programming changes, additional costs or other problems might be involved in any future decision to commence broadcasting in the Baltic languages. If the Department concludes that such broadcasts cannot be undertaken under current budgetary guidelines without seriously jeopardizing other high-priority programs in other languages, a full justification for this position should be provided.

I can assure you that any information the Department is able to furnish along these lines will be given most serious consideration by this Committee.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1973.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee, Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MORGAN: I am enclosing a copy of a self-explanatory letter which I have received from one of my constituents, Mr. Osvalds Akmentins.

I would be most appreciative for any attention which the committee might be able to give to Mr. Akmentins' remarks when you take up consideration of FY 74 authorizations for Radio Liberty.

With much appreciation and kindest regards, I remain
Sincerely,

JAMES A. BURKE,
Member of Congress.

DORCHESTER, MASS., April 18, 1973.

JAMES A. BURKE,
*U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I urge and recommend that "Radio Liberty" and "Radio Free Europe" overhaul their present operations and start broadcast in all languages of the Captive European Nations, without any discrimination of the three Baltic nations—Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians.

I urge that appropriate steps are taken to provide sources of fundings for this purpose in order to express the American principle that all nations have the right to be free.

Sincerely yours,

OSVALDS AKMENTINS,
Latvian Press Society in America.

TESTIMONY OF MR. OSVALDS AKMENTINS, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, LATVIAN
PRESS SOCIETY

"The broadcastings are very necessary in Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian languages. These three European nations have suffered too much under lasting foreign occupation. Many leaders and people of these countries are killed or exterminated in the Russian slave labor camps. We are confronted with the fact that Latvians and Estonians constitute less than 60 per cent of the population in Latvia and Estonia. Latvians and Estonians will be reduced to minorities in their native countries within a decade. People of these countries daily were indoctrinated in communism, especially youth, therefore broadcastings from Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe could be an historical mission in creating an educated people to a better understanding of the Western world.

The situation in Latvia is very bad: the birth rate is the lowest of any of the Soviet oppressed nations. And, due to Russian floodings, many Latvian families have broken apart.

It would be more shocking if the European Security Conference in Helsinki could not help oppressed Baltic people. As you know, Mr. Congressman, three Baltic delegations who arrived at Helsinki to represent and defend their own people were arrested by the Finnish police under Russian pressure. This news was delivered to listeners by Radio Liberty, but in the native languages of the Baltic countries.

There is no justified reason why the oldest European languages; Lithuanian and Latvian, were discriminated against all these years, while the Slavik languages have always received attention from Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe since the beginning of these broadcastings.

Therefore we should give help to the neglected Baltic people by broadcastings in their native languages.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., August 2, 1973.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of June 22, 1973, which relates to H.R. 8144. You asked for a full status report on the question of initiation by Radio Liberty of Baltic language broadcasts.

Radio Liberty planned to initiate Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian language broadcasts in FY 74. The Department of State, which presently administers grants of federal funds to Radio Liberty, gave approval of this plan. However, the \$270,000 proposed for this project and other "new project" funds requested by Radio Liberty were eliminated from the FY 74 budget as submitted by the Administration to the Congress in January 1973. This resulted from budgetary stringencies as well as the undetermined future of Radio Liberty, pending the outcome of the report of the Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting and Presidential and Congressional action thereon.

H.R. 8144 would authorize establishment of a Board for International Broadcasting to administer federal grants in support of continued broadcasting operations by Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. The proposed FY 74 grant for Radio Liberty operations was amended from \$16,270,000 in the President's budget

to \$18,330,690, as reflected in H.R. 8144, to offset the effect of the February 1973 devaluation of the dollar against currencies in Europe, where 80% of Radio Liberty operations are conducted. However, further devaluation in the past three months has left Radio Liberty some \$2,000,000 short of funds to carry on its operations at the planned FY 74 level, assuming authorization and appropriation of the full amount requested by the Administration.

The budgetary picture described above, in our view, strongly militates against consideration of overhauling Radio Liberty operations this year to make way for future broadcasts in the Baltic languages. Moreover, even if Radio Liberty were to eliminate some of the 18 languages presently broadcast, this would not produce immediate savings. The separation allowances required by contract and by union agreement to pay staff that Radio Liberty would have to terminate would absorb all potential savings for a full year.

Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of State continues to support Radio Liberty's intention to begin broadcasts to the Baltic peoples in their native languages as soon as practicable. We believe that passage by the Congress this year of the proposed authorizing and appropriation legislation would provide the essential base of security and stability for Radio Liberty to reopen the question of such broadcast operations in its FY 75 budget presentation.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to express the Department's appreciation for your extraordinary effort during the hectic final days of FY 1973 to introduce and obtain both Committee and House action on the devaluation supplemental authorization for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. The funds provided badly-needed help to the stations in meeting some of the most critical costs stemming from the devaluation.

Sincerely,

MARSHALL WRIGHT,

Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

CORRESPONDENCE OF HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, AND PROF. ALFRED G. MEYER, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., September 7, 1973.

Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would appreciate it if the attached letter from Professor Alfred G. Meyer, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan, on H.R. 8144 concerning the financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty could be included in the hearing record for this legislation.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Ann Arbor, Mich., August 12, 1973.

Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROSENTHAL: This will acknowledge your letter of 3 August, just forwarded to me, concerning H.R. 8144, which proposes continued funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and the establishment of a Board for International Broadcasting. My reactions to this legislative proposal are roughly, the following:

1. The United States government already has a long-established and well-functioning machinery for broadcasts to foreign nations, the Voice of America of the U.S. Information Agency. The Voice of America, on the basis of the sketchy information I possess on it, appears to be doing a competent job, though on the

whole the international reputation of the BBC is much higher. Information, even the most balanced, coming from governments is always suspect to the recipient.

2. The two radio networks to be financed under the proposed legislation were set up precisely for this reason. Covertly set up by the CIA, or with CIA help, they masqueraded themselves as private organizations and independent news services, a pretense which was never believed by the recipients of its broadcasts even before the CIA cover was blown. Now that their true nature is known, they simply constitute CIA competition with the USIA in the field of foreign broadcasting; and the maintenance of such a bureaucratic rivalry does not seem worth fifty million dollars.

3. Partly because of the transparent pretense under which they operated, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as well as their parent organizations have been prime symbols of the cold war at its harshest and are such symbols still today. While there have been significant modifications in the outlook of its managerial and reportorial personnel over the years, they still tend to be unrelenting cold-warriors. Within the profession of specialists in the study of the communist world of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union they tend to be the ones who have learned the least and changed the least.

4. But the Cold War—that is clear in retrospect—was, on the whole a mad and irrational episode in American foreign policy, with disastrous consequences for this country and the world. While the rivalry and the jockeying for power between the USA and the USSR were natural consequences of World War II, the general assumptions about the nature, capabilities, functioning, and intentions of the Soviet regime, its bloc of allies, and its leaders assumptions which provided the basis for American policies since the end of the war—have been demonstrably mistaken most of the time. The country is still paying dearly for these mistakes.

5. If in previous decades Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, symbolizing the spirit of the Cold War, were at least in tune with the policies practiced by the U.S. government, they are no longer in tune with the spirit of businesslike dealings and détente that seems to have been introduced in recent months. On the contrary, they have become anachronisms.

6. The activities of these radio stations are based on the assumption that we, in the United States, are the exclusive source of enlightenment in an otherwise dark world. Whatever pride we all may feel in the achievements of our system and the benefits it confers on some of us, the arrogance behind this assumption is an unwise attitude to take; it tends to backfire politically.

7. The slogan about the "Right to Know", which expresses this arrogance most clearly, is likely to remind some people of the late Dr. Goebbels and the name he gave his organization: the Ministry of Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda. I, for one, am very much in favor of the right to know. But as long as I have to fight against my own government for the right to know what is being done in my name in South-East Asia, in Bangladesh, or right here at home, I prefer to have my tax dollars spent for that fight rather than have the people of Pinsk or Bratislava enlightened by frustrated political have-beens from their own country.

8. From the point of view of international law, these broadcasting activities may constitute illicit interference in the affairs of other nations. Contrary to assumptions made quite widely, American efforts of this kind have been far more aggressive than those of communist states.

9. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have a clientele of listeners in the countries to which they beam their messages. But the number of these faithful listeners is probably small. Claims to the contrary notwithstanding, the reputation of these stations (and their parent organizations) is not very high. Some of the more blatant attempts at subversion and other covert work have discredited them as much as the failure of the United States to aid the Hungarian uprising of 1956. In the long run, the growing stabilization of the communist regimes and their long-run successes in economic and political policies are much more serious causes for the decline in the legitimacy and credibility of the two radio stations. From major disturbers they have now turned into minor irritants. In past decades, their existence might have been a potential asset in bargaining with Soviet and East European political leaders, though it was not used. Now it is a trump card no longer.

10. Undeniably there is a small number of dissenters in the communist countries who avidly listen to these stations, like what they hear, obtain important information from them, and are heartened in their resistance by having these sources of information and support. They will feel betrayed by the closing of these stations. But, of course, by traveling to Peking and by receiving Mr. Brezhnev in his home, Mr. Nixon has betrayed them much more thoroughly already. Continuing the public financing of these stations would inject a new inconsistency into our stance toward the communist world. In the final analysis, this inconsistency could be explained only as a political concession to all those Americans who still cling to the illusions of the past.

I will be happy to discuss this matter with you if you should so desire. You can reach me at the Maine address I have given at the top of my letter until 22 August. After 26 August I will be back at the University of Michigan.

Yours sincerely,

ALFRED G. MEYER, *Professor.*

○